

THE
CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. VI.

JANUARY, 1854.

No. 4.

ART. I.—WORKS OF SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE.

The Complete Works of SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE, with an Introductory Essay upon his Philosophical and Theological Opinions. Edited by Professor SHEDD. In Seven Volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1853.

It is now about twenty years since Coleridge died. Usually, this has been deemed time enough to settle the fame and influence of most men. The more celebrated cotemporaries of Coleridge have, with scarce an exception, had their places long since assigned them on the scale of public regard. Nor must this be taken as an indication of inferior powers, or a narrower, less important sphere of activity. Since, among them were poets, critics, and thinkers whom the world has, by common consent, agreed to consider immortal. Widely otherwise, in this respect, has it fared with Coleridge. Though confessedly, in some departments of thought, the leading English mind of his day; and though possessed of a genius for creative art and speculative inquiry, whose splendor of faculty and achievement forbade the possibility of any general difference of opinion, as to his intellectual rank; yet he failed in his own, and partially, he has failed in this generation, to secure even an approach to an unanimous verdict upon the merit of his works, or upon the quality and degree of influence which they are destined to exert. In the majority of minds,

he is still a *terra incognita*, while to a moiety of those who claim to have explored him, the "main region" of his thought is only vapor and "mooned mysticism." Some of the elements of his fame are still without a guarantee for perpetuity. And, what is worse, it is still an open question whether he shall be accredited as a safe teacher of the rising intellect of the age; or be branded with suspicion by the friends of truth, as one to be classed among those daring abstractionists, the drift of whose thinking has been to sap the foundations of ethics and religion.

It is certainly time this question was settled. There is vast power of some sort in the pages of Coleridge, and a fascination about the freshness and fertility of its developments, which makes it the merest prudence to ascertain its quality and direction. Surely, so much intellectual muscle ought not to lie dormant in this age of battles. Surely, the defenders of a Revealed Faith are not in a condition to decline, or to neglect any alliance which, through high forms of mental energy, or systems of metaphysical speculation reverently devoted to the proof and elucidation of the most solemn truths of Morals and Religion, promises to strengthen their position and to supply new resources for the conflict with avowed infidels or—which are more formidable—the advocates of an emasculated Christianity.

We rejoice, therefore, at the appearance of this—the first complete edition of the works of Coleridge. We hail its publication as an event that will, by reviving discussion and furnishing more ample means for a right judgment, contribute much toward fixing, for all time, the reputation and influence of one of the most earnest and thoughtful minds, which it was the glory of the last age to have produced.

In the cursory remarks we shall offer, it is our wish to present an appreciative, but candid estimate of the genius and labors of Coleridge. To this end, we shall first note some of the leading features of his character, and then consider what he has done in the departments of Literature and Theological inquiry. Having done this, we shall venture an opinion as to the tendency and measure of his influence on the discussions of the age. In stating the order of our thoughts, we have assigned no separate place to the philosophy of our author, for the reason, that we regard it, as did he, as included in the department of Religious inquiry. He pursued, to be sure, philosophy as an independent topic, and gave to it a large share of his time and strength. But in the maturity of his intellect, when he gave himself up to the solution of the profoundest

problems arising out of the nature and destiny of the human soul, he was in the habit of regarding his philosophical acquisitions as altogether subordinate to the interests of Theology, and as valuable only in this connection.

But, as preliminary, to what we have farther to say, it is proper to notice the auspices under which this admirable edition appears. The "Introductory Essay" by Professor Shedd, is genial, discriminating, and judicious. His remarks on Coleridge's connection with Kant and Schelling are able and conclusive; and his vindication of Coleridge from the charge of Pantheism is triumphant and final. But, while in the main, we can cordially assent to the principles and statements of the Essay, we feel constrained to protest against some of his conclusions. We refer to his language (p. 37) respecting the Calvinistic bias of Coleridge;* and (p. 51) where he affirms *guilt* to be the *essential* nature of sin. Whereas, according to both Scripture and philosophy—not to mention the authority of St. Augustine, who enters more thoroughly into the metaphysics of this question than any other writer, ancient or modern—guilt is an inseparable property and necessary consequence of sin, but not its essence.

In contemplating the character of Coleridge, we are impressed not more with its wonderful exuberance of the elements of moral and intellectual greatness, than with its lack of balance in their combination. There was marvelous wealth of faculty in all directions, together with the most various and exquisite aptitude for every species of mental achievement. There was

* Prof. Shedd seems to take for granted that Coleridge was substantially a Calvinist, because he sympathized with Augustine in the Pelagian controversy. Now, if his sympathy with Augustine is to be regarded as the measure of his Calvinism, we shall find the latter reduced to a very narrow compass. For, while Coleridge agreed with Augustine in the doctrines of man's freedom and natural depravity, together with that of the necessity of a spiritual regeneration through supernatural grace,—which were the main points in the issue with Pelagius and Julian; yet he was far from accepting Augustine's views on predestination and final perseverance. But if Coleridge dissented from Augustine on these points, still wider and deeper must have been his dissent from those peculiarities of Calvin's system, which vitalized it into an *ism*. For those peculiarities consisted in a revival of the teachings of St. Augustine on predestination, and their logical union with the doctrine of unconditional election. But furthermore, Calvin, in order to harmonize every thing with his central thought, and secure a rational sequence between the several parts of his system,—in other words, more resolutely logical than the illustrious Genius whom he followed,—was obliged to deny the free agency of man; or, at least, to assert only a fictional freedom. Now to see how far asunder the theology of Coleridge is from Calvinism, we have only to remember how earnestly he battled for the moral liberty of the soul, and how essential to any healthy divinity, he considered a full admission of the doctrine of the self-determining power of the will. As a divine Coleridge was not altogether an Augustinian, far less was he a Calvinist.

an overplus of power—an excess of intellect, sensibility, and affection—a strange lavishing on a single nature of the most royal gifts of humanity. But there was a too little as well as a too much—a sad want of proportion in his making up. He failed to be master of himself—a feeble will was linked to immense intellectual energy, and an almost irresistible momentum of sensibility. Hence, during much of his life, he seemed like some rich, huge argosy of thought and passion floating dreamily on the world's fitful tide. And hence it was, too, that, now and then, he appeared, amid occasional seasons of stagnation, like a vast hulk thrown up on the beach to rot: while, for many years, he suffered his soul to trail in the mire of a gross and consuming vice. The annals of genius contain no sadder chapter, than that, which now holds up to view the lurid night that so long rested on his soul. But, tenderly, would we speak of this soil on the mantle of his greatness. We have no heart to linger over it, far less, as some have done, to make it the theme of an idle rhetorical lament; and we have now alluded to it, only to point to the origin of his lapse, in the weakness of his will, as compared with the gigantic strength and astonishing fulness of his intellectual and sensuous endowments. This flaw of character—this deficiency of voluntary power which enslaved him to a vicious habit, flowed out beyond his private conduct into his intercourse with men. So that, though he felt the keenest relish for the delights of friendship, and loved to surrender his whole being to the inspection of others; yet he often incurred the charge of culpable capriciousness and instability in his attachments and intimacies. Nor was this at all singular, when we reflect, that permanence of object and tenacity of grasp, in the moral powers and social affections, are to be looked for, only in union with force of will and stable self-control.

But the disproportion between will and impulse, in his moral nature, was not greater, than that which existed, in the region of pure intellect, between the copiousness of his resources and his constructive ability. His genius was hampered by its own fertility. The harvests were too quick and luxuriant, to allow an orderly gathering of their fruits: and so, it often happened, that the golden grain rotted on the field, because he could not decide where to thrust in the sickle. While, moreover, that which lower minds censured as indolence, and decried as a reckless waste of power, was only the natural hesitancy of a genius so prolific and diversified, that it knew not which of its manifold treasures to work up first. Coleridge spent little time in building structures, though he provided the granite and cedar for myriads of them.

This lack of constructive talent and compact method has, sometimes, been urged as a circumstance likely to affect his influence as a thinker. To some extent, it may ; for the mass love to see deep as well as common thought duly shelved, sorted, and labeled : they love to see vast powers harnessed to stringent system, and toiling under its severe limitations. And yet, it must not be forgotten, that nearly all the world's real wisdom, especially that from above, has come to it in fractional shapes—in flashes from a hidden fire—in single utterances from souls fighting grandly and bravely for the light. System is useful, but not indispensable to the highest measure of influence. Often, it is only a means of renewing the freshness of common places ; or of padding out, into attractive shape, mere crudities of speculation.

In the mind of Coleridge, there was a combination of powers seldom found together. Impetuous emotion and severe ratiocination ; passionate ardor of imagination and the dry light of abstract thought ; "the vision and faculty divine," and a nimble, metaphysical subtlety ; analytic acumen and synthetic grasp—each and all entered largely into the composition of his genius :—how largely, can be estimated only by his wonderful achievements in poetry, philosophy, and criticism. In speaking of the contrasted traits of his intellect, we have said nothing of the two qualities, which perhaps, beyond any others, individualized it. We refer to its extraordinary power of association and assimilation, and to its fullness of living energy. By the first, it brought all knowledge under its mastery, marshaling its divisions like the obedient ranks of an army : while by the second, it clothed with its own vitality everything it handled. And thus it chanced, that the genial, energetic blood of Coleridge often coursed through other men's arteries ; and washed, in its own virtue, their dearth and impotency. As nature caught, instinctively, the illumination of his glance, and put on a living beauty at his presence ; so the brain issues of the dead arose, at his word, to the glorified estate of a mental resurrection. In this, the distinguishing property of his genius, we doubt whether he ever had a superior. Comparing him, indeed, with some of the largest names of a past age, we find in Coleridge, with some abatement of proportion, the exuberance of Jeremy Taylor ; the sublimity and depth, the delicacy and grace of Pascal ; bound up in effective union with the metaphysical acumen of Des Cartes, and the immense erudition of Leibnitz.

Still, with all this proud array of faculties he was not, save in the sphere of the imagination, a real creator or discoverer

of essentially new forms of thought. He ranks not with the *Dii Majores*. He had an abundant originality ; but it was the originality of combination, not invention. He rose not, by independent flight, to the mystic and solemn height of Plato's thought ; nor did he, by a self-poised descent, reach the dark profound of Kant's speculative genius. Yet so large was his mould, that he easily apprehended and measured both ; and we may safely challenge a rival for him in the successful and vivid rendering of the ideas of the one, and the subtle, evasive distinctions of the other.

Before leaving this part of our subject, we wish to say a few words on the actual and moral side of the character of Coleridge. Our first remark is, that he was not the mere mystic and dreamer, that it has been the world's habit to regard him. He was a thinker by profession, not a man of action ; but he was a toilsome thinker—a very worker in the sphere of ideas and principles. He cared not to claim paternity for all that he gave to the world, nor did he pause to acquire a bookish fame. His processes of thought were often circuitous and remote from popular association ; but when turning on themes in morals, or policy, or religion, they always had a practical end. He loved theory only as the condition of sounder practice, and speculation he valued and pursued only as preliminary to the settlement of real issues. He failed to win the public ear while he lived ; but he impressed his image on the few who think for the multitude. And it has come to pass, that much which was once laughed at as air and moonshine—as having no bearing on the souls or destinies of men—is now recognized as the precious coinage of a sublime and far sighted wisdom. If Coleridge was a dreamer, an idle abstractionist, so too was Plato, and so was Aristotle ; and yet out of their thinking, have been spun the intellectual sinews of many generations. It is a popular folly to consider all contemplation *per se* as unpractical, and abstract studies as mere ideal gymnastics. It is forgotten that the actual is only the flowering out of the ideal, and that the utilities of the present hour are not seldom the abstractions of yesterday. Those who nail shingles on the roof of a building, make more noise than those who dig the foundation ; but it may be doubted whether their work is more practical. It is the soil at the roots of the tree that, more than any other agent, determines the size of the trunk, the spread of the branches, and the quality of the fruit. Certainly, it will not do in this age, when thought and action change places with such startling rapidity, to decry metaphysical speculation, or to dispute the practical benefits conferred by those whose vocation it is to think.

It was one of the aphorisms of Lord Bacon, that a knowledge of the speculative principles of men in general, between the age of twenty and thirty, is one of the great sources of political prophecy. And, as a notable instance of the extent to which popular struggles and religious revolutions may germinate from abstract problems, which, in themselves, seem too idle to justify a moment's discussion ; we may refer to the old contest of Nominalism and Realism. This contest gave birth to rival systems of metaphysics, which, for two generations, agitated the schools, and them only. Through these systems, however, it emerged from the character of an abstract issue ; and escaping from the domain of metaphysics, passed over into that of religion, and from religion advanced into the region of politics. It then took its place in the annals of nations, and was felt in the diplomacy of cabinets and the debates of Sacred Councils. Roscelin, Abélard, and Occam were Nominalists, and so, too, were they the historical and logical progenitors of Peter d'Ailly and John Gerson, the fathers of the Gallican Church, and of Martin Luther—the presiding genius in the Continental Reformation of the sixteenth Century. Coleridge, then, we say, was not necessarily an idler or a dreamer, because, he gave himself up to contemplation.

But it would be an injustice not to claim more than this. His deepest, subtlest speculation, (excepting of course the phantom reveries into which his soul was drugged by opium,) always looked onward to a useful end. This, no diligent student of his works will deny. To any fair reader, they are their own exponents and witnesses on this point. The "Biographia Literaria" abounds in irreversible verdicts on the most important questions in literature. The "Lay Sermons" are excelled in depth and wealth of political wisdom, only by the masterly tractates of Burke. The "Friend," usually deemed the most unpractical of books, has, in some way, insinuated itself into the most wholesome, social theorizing of the age. And as for the "Aids to Reflection," if it have any meaning at all, its aim is manifestly to regulate human action, by planting all external morality on the profound basis of religious obligation ; and to illustrate the momentous truth, that Christianity appeals for its reception by the human mind, primarily to the will and not to the understanding—to capabilities of faith and not to powers of thought. We have dwelt the longer on this aspect of our author's character, because it has been so often asserted and admitted, that his intense, habitual intellectualism disqualified him for the office of a moral preceptor.

There is another trait in the character of Coleridge, which

should not go unmentioned. We mean his incorruptible, unquenchable love of truth. He loved it with a sacred fervor and an indescribable awe. He loved it in itself, apart from all interest, and with a passionate devotion, which, as he confesses, often constrained him to "creep toward the light though it drew him away from the more nourishing warmth." It is pleasant to linger over this characteristic; for beyond any other, it seems to reveal the main drift and undercurrent of his soul. It gives reality to those outbursts of desire for a better life—for a spiritual disenthralment, which arose amid the periods of his saddest degradation; and which, like a beam from heaven, lay over those years of sin and sorrow irradiating the night which it could not exclude, and witnessing to affinities for moral goodness, which God's grace, at last, lifted from the miserable bondage of a gross self-indulgence. It was this trait that won, for Coleridge, a true catholicity of temper in every department of thought. He never could become a partisan, for, the basis of his judgment always eliminated or included something essential to the limits of party: and just as little could he narrow down his sympathies to a school or a sect. He never could bring himself to deny the half of England's historic glory, or to cavil at the moral and mental greatness of many of her sons, because they did not harmonize with the traditions and policies in Church and State, which he was wont to revere. He never considered it necessary, for example, because he was a churchman, to disparage Milton's poetry, or to speak contemptuously of the fame and influence of Luther or Calvin. Genius, learning, moral worth, noble aims, and high resolves, wherever manifested among the strifes of men, always found in him a discriminating and genial advocate.

In presenting the foregoing estimate of the character of Coleridge, it may be thought, that too little has been said of his moral delinquencies. We have said little, because it has been the fashion to say overmuch on this point. For many years, the errors of Coleridge have been a favorite theme with that class of magazine writers who, to be noticed at all, must be smart and pungent; and with whom it is equivalent to half a fortune made, to be able to rub up a few ulcers on some great reputation. And then, too, we cannot forget how successful have been the bitter taunts of De Quincey, and the cold sneers of Carlyle. Everybody knows that Coleridge was an opium eater. Everybody can tell of his infirmities, vacillations, and sins. The world has the story by heart. For these reasons, we have forborne to do more than name the fact. We mourn over his lapse; but we remember the strug-

gle to rise, the penitential tears which rained on the traces of his sin, that aged form bowed at the foot of the Cross, and that touching epitaph, penned amid the gathering shades of death :

" Stop, Christian passer-by—Stop, child of God,
And read with gentle breast. Beneath this sod
A poet lies, or that which once seem'd he—
O lift one thought in prayer for S. T. C. ;
That he who many a year with toil of breath
Found death in life, may here find life in death !
Mercy for praise—to be forgiven for fame
He ask'd and hoped, through Christ. Do thou the same."

And remembering these things, we have no heart to sit, or even to seem to do so, in judgment on the sinkings and wanderings of his strange career.

With these remarks on the leading moral and intellectual traits of Coleridge, we proceed to speak of him in the sphere of letters. It was in this relation that the public knew him earliest and best. His poetry and criticism commanded immediate attention, and at once became influential. Many there are who warm into enthusiasm over his literature, who vote his philosophy and theology a bore. It has been common for those, who have failed to appreciate his remarkable aptitude for handling abstract themes, and have dwelt exclusively on his literary genius, to lament that all his energies should not have been devoted to the development of the latter. Beyond a doubt, Coleridge might, with even a fair husbanding of his powers, have joined hands with the great masters of song. There was no height or duration of fame, to which, he might not have justly aspired. Considering how prodigally every poetic element was lavished on him, it is hardly extravagant to say, that with a tithe of Wordsworth's fixedness of aim, or Southey's industry, he would have towered far beyond his most gifted rivals. As it was, he gave to the world only touches of the sublime harmony which swept over his spirit—snatches from the plenitude of his inspiration—fragments of his unwrought wealth. Hence, whatever the intrinsic power and fertility of his poetic genius, he must ever appear fractionally in the domain of art ; and must be judged as one who excited hopes which he did not justify.

Still, his bequest, though a mere bundle of fragments, is rich in variety, magnificent in aspiration, and intensely charged with the blended fires of his nature. His poetry was the varying resultant of all the active forces of his being. It stands out to the eye, like a revelation of the essential grain and texture of the soul—a very section cut from its living growth,

and saturated through and through with its inmost vitality. It shows that he loved nature with a love as deep as that of Wordsworth ; that he was moved by a sensibility as tender and exquisite as that of Keats : and that while he possessed the passionate, ideal intellectualism of Shelley, and was not wanting in Byron's intensity of imagination and faculty of condensed imagery, he was superior to all of them in his mastery over the resources of language, and the witcheries of verse.

In this respect, Coleridge's talent was truly marvelous. Beyond any writer of his time, he had searched into the hidden roots of the English tongue, and become familiar with the elements which entered into, and the circumstances which modified its historic evolution. He knew its structure as an organic whole, in the same sense, that the anatomist knows the framework of a human body. At will, he could touch those hidden nerves of separate words and phrases which, at one moment, erect them into saliences of expression, or bind them up as the "incarnations of thought;" and, at any other, level them into the grave march of prose, or melt them into the flowing melody of verse. This astonishing knowledge of the powers and properties of words gave to his use of them, an unrivaled accuracy and precision. He used them, indeed, with the same nice discrimination and instinctive skill which distinguish the sculptor's handling of his tools, from that of the common hewer of granite. This gift, partly native, and partly acquired, was quite as remarkable in those huge collocations of words and sentences, wherein he occasionally mirrored the vast horizon of his thought, as in lines of verse, where he seemed yearning to embody the subtlest refinements of sound and sentiment.

But we are admonished by our limits, as well as by what we have to offer on another part of our subject, that we must restrict ourselves to a bare enumeration of the main characteristics of the poetry of our author. It was occasional and spontaneous ; combining imaginative views of political struggles and philosophical problems, with an exquisite sensibility to natural beauty, and the devout yearnings of a soul seeking after the highest forms of moral and spiritual truth. We have characterized it as occasional ; because, with the exception of the "Ancient Marinere" and "Christabel," which were products of pure imagination, it was mostly suggested by external events ; and as spontaneous, because, it was an involuntary utterance of the profoundest feelings of the heart. Coleridge, if ever any man was, was a poet from necessity. He wrote verse because he could not help it. His brooding,

sensitive spirit, aroused by the tocsin of civil revolution, and the promise of nobler humanities for the race, or "swelling vast to heaven," amid the sublimity of natural scenery, or swept by a passionate idealism of conception, vented itself in song, as irrepressibly as water leaps from the fountain, or light bursts from the risen sun. We only add, that it was this spontaneousness—this overflowing force of soul—that placed his odes at the head of English lyrics, and won for them a special immortality.

But Coleridge, the poet, was not half so potent as Coleridge, the critic. There is little danger of exaggerating the value of what he did in this capacity. Here he distanced competition, not only in the gifts which so eminently qualified him for the critic's task, but in the intrinsic worth of his contributions to the science as well as art of criticism. If we look to his gifts, we find on the moral side, sincerity, candor, and judicial impartiality: on the æsthetic, a living, genial sympathy with every phasis of genuine art, a sensibility to the beautiful, almost morbid in its intense and devouring activity, and an intuitive discernment of the significance of the types and forms employed by creative genius: while if we turn to the intellectual side, we discover an experimental knowledge of all the stages in the genesis and evolution of poetic thought; comprehensiveness of view, united to microscopic minuteness; an acuteness and severity of analysis, which could resolve into their elements, and throw into orderly array the most tangled miscellanies of fact and fiction; and a power over language, which enabled him to reproduce, in full and exact measure, the finest shades of an author's thought, together with the very flavor and texture of his imagery. His was, indeed, a splendid equipment, and right nobly did he use it. It has been said with equal truth and felicity, that the intellectual issues of Coleridge have been "melted into the rising literatures of England and America." It is a remark whose force many may fail to see in the departments of philosophy and theology; but in that of criticism, it must be admitted by all. He shouldered this branch of letters, bodily, and bore it onward many degrees toward perfection.

But in order to any adequate estimate of what he accomplished, it is necessary to view him not only as he wrought in detail, but also as the leader of a revolution in public taste. It is now universally conceded, that a most salutary change occurred in England's literary creed, during the first quarter of the present century. It was a change, by which, the over-civilized, over-refined thought of the 18th century was eman-

cipated from its effeminacy, and restored to a condition of freshness and vigor. It was a change from conventionalism to nature, from artificiality to art, and from arbitrary dogmas to philosophical principles. It was a change which swept, from the field of English letters, the tokens of a forced growth and a sham illumination; and poured over its borders the real light of stars and the bracing air of the mountains. In producing this revolution, Coleridge was to criticism what Wordsworth was to poetry. Both, for a time, were alike victimized by the contumely and reproach of a vanishing dotage. Both endured the bitter ire of disappointed aspirants, whose toil had been shaped by the dictum of a dethroned culture; and both triumphed—the one in a philosophy of criticism built on the fundamental principles of the human intellect—the other in a style of poetry which embodies, in imaginative forms, the reciprocal relations of man and nature, and in the simplicity of their own order.

As is usual with revolutions of this sort, the new thinking, of which we have spoken, was duly organized into a school. This school, like every other intended to promote the diffusion of novel modes of thought, soon manifested a tendency to extremes. Fretted by opposition, and goaded by calumny, it came near, in the violence of its reaction, passing over into a species of literary puritanism, wherein hatred of corruption easily sinks into love of baldness and coarseness. Here, Coleridge appeared as a mediator, and checked this extreme tendency; showing that though much of the old must be rejected, yet that nearly as much of it must be retained and fused into the new. He planted himself, with admirable discrimination, on that ever changing line which divides, and yet consummates conservatism and progress; and unfolded them as the same force projected in opposite directions. It was in this capacity, that he was constrained to protest against many of the principles in Wordsworth's theory of poetic diction, and to show to the world, that the merit of that great master's poetry sprang from a partial disobedience to his own theoretic laws.

Turning, now, from our author's leadership of an important revolution in letters, to his special contributions in the sphere of criticism, we find him as noteworthy in the one as the other. The latter we have space only to name. Among the points he demonstrated and enforced were the following—that every work of genius, every creation of art, is an orderly expansion from an organizing centre—a living growth, not a congeries of inanimate parts; and hence that such a work will

be distinguished by the evidences of a vital process—by organic form, and not mere mechanical regularity—that, therefore, before we sit as judges, we are bound to seek after and fairly interpret this interior life, recognizing the law and aim of its development. He showed, moreover, that beauty is a principle having its ground in nature and the mind of man—a spontaneous effluence from the worlds of matter and spirit; not that mutable, accidental, artificial thing which it had been the fashion to represent it. He demonstrated the fallacy of the old antithetic dogma of the opposition of genius to taste, and of inventive power to sound judgment. He overthrew all that was arbitrary in the rules and traditions of the previous tribunals in literature, and established criticism on the basis of a solid and luminous philosophy. Great and widespread has been his influence, in this respect; and it is not too much to say, that the most enlightened and distinguished critics of to-day are only warming into life the seeds he planted, and applying a wisdom which he elaborated.*

Having spoken of Coleridge, the man, the poet, the critic, we proceed to consider Coleridge, the theologian. This side of him is, to us, the most interesting and important of any. We enter on the study of it with a full sense of the diversity of opinion which exists as to its bearings; and, with a conviction that the time is come when the position of Coleridge should be better understood and more thoroughly defined. It is well known that he lays no claim to the authorship of a system of divinity, and that, by his own profession, he only aspires to what, some might regard, as the humbler distinction of an expounder and defender of a method of inquiry and reflection on theological subjects. He attempted no new arrangement of the doctrines of Revealed Truth, nor of the ancient creeds of the Church; but confined himself solely to the task of justifying them, by rational illustration, to the intellect and conscience. And, hence, he is presented to us, by way of eminence, in the capacity of a reflective theologian. Coming before us in this shape, obviously the first inquiry to be made respecting him, is one that will bring out the very *tone* and

* It has been common to detract from the merit of Coleridge as a critic by magnifying his indebtedness to German sources, and particularly to Schlegel. But the time for this has gone by. It is now positively known, that Coleridge had worked out his system in principle and detail, and had applied it to the elucidation of Shakespeare's genius, before Schlegel's essay was published. Schlegel and Coleridge were the two greatest expounders of the Shakspearian drama. Equals in learning and comprehensiveness, Coleridge excelled in analysis and sensibility, and was therefore able to unfold more successfully Shakespeare's most remarkable trait—his power of characterization.

animus of his style of thinking, and show how they bear on the teaching and life of the Church. Our own views on this point will be presented in the form of an examination of the leading objections which, from time to time, have been urged against Coleridge as a religious thinker and teacher.

I. It has been urged that he was, during nearly all his life, in an unsettled, and transitional state of mind; and that therefore we can hope to find little virtue in so vacillating a mode of thought exercised in any direction, much less, when directed to Theology, whose distinguishing feature should be stability.

Now, the force of this objection will be much abated, by a due regard to certain important facts in the mental history of Coleridge. Intense, unceasing activity characterized his mind from first to last. He was in the habit of often canvassing the grounds of his settled convictions; and not unfrequently, from the air with which he handled the best ascertained principles, did he seem to doubt their truth. He wished to bottom his opinions on what was ultimate in human thought; and it troubled him to feel that there was any height or depth accessible to legitimate speculation, which he had not reached. Hence, not seldom, he seemed to be indulging a wavering, halting temper, when, in fact, he was only seeking to cut his belief deeper and deeper into his consciousness, and to surround it with an opulence of proof. And, so, it often happened that a love of exhaustive discussion, and a desire to plant his convictions on ever deepening and widening foundations, was construed into a capriciousness of mind incompatible with settled and determinate views on any subject, and especially on theological ones. But, we remark farther, that change does not always indicate vacillation. We mean by vacillation, a state in which the mind swings between conflicting issues and tendencies, with an incapacity to settle fixedly on any. Thus understood, it was never a trait of Coleridge. He yearned for a firm footing, and the frequent and radical changes indicated by the record of his opinions were only so many utterances of that desire. It should never be objected to a man that he shifts his ground often, provided it be from bad to good. Rather, should it be taken as a token of a healthy and muscular tone of mind, and of lively affinities towards light and truth. It was in this sense, that Coleridge was eminently a transitional man. He started in error and ended in truth, and never was an intellectual and moral pilgrimage trodden over with a more sturdy and heroic step; never did one terminate in a victory more sublime, or in a re-

pose more steadfast. He began a materialist in philosophy, and ended in a system in which God, freedom, and immortality were indigenous conceptions. He started amid the negations of Socinianism, and came out the advocate of a Theology as positive and compact as Catholic doctrine could make it. He began an admirer of the revolutionary teachings of France, and ended an ardent supporter of England's Constitutional freedom. Surely, such transitions indicate anything but lack of virtue in the tone and mode of his thinking. Much more do they evidence a depth, solidity, and continuity of reflective power, rarely found, save in alliance with noble ends, as well as high genius.

(II.) It has been objected that Coleridge had no proper reverence for that great principle of the Church—regard for early authority. Now, it must be remembered, that this objection comes, only from a quarter, which has won no very enviable notoriety, by its efforts to disparage the intellect as a factor in Theology; and to convert the reception of the Christian faith into a matter of habit and feeling, rather than one of intelligent conviction. In this direction, the tone of Coleridge's thinking has been exceedingly distasteful, and simply because, he could not assent to certain extravagant opinions respecting the value of Patristic learning, as an arbiter in modern controversies. But, however he may be esteemed by this school of theologians—a school that used and praised him up to a certain point, and censured him only when he refused to share in their extremes, we believe the ground he took with regard to the Fathers, and ecclesiastical tradition, and subjects of a kindred nature, harmonized with the general mind of the Church. Constituted as he was, it was impossible for him to receive a merely hereditary and passive faith, or to be content with a system which affected to despise rational inquiry, or to be careless about the sanctions of enlightened reason. An unquestioning recipiency was utterly alien to the structure and habit of his mind. To excogitate—to work out, by conscious processes, the results finally adopted into his creed—was a necessity of his organization; and yet no man was ever more loyal to truth, or richer in faith; no man ever more freely assented to the mysteries of our Holy Religion, or subscribed more heartily to the doctrine of the supremacy of the spiritual, over the knowing side of our nature, or felt more solemnly his responsibility for the use made of the powers of thought. No one more thoroughly abhorred the style of thinking generated by Locke's metaphysics and Paley's ethics—a style in which “all men's wisdom” yields to “each man's notions;” or, in

other words, the historic and well defined consciousness of the Church, to the pride and extravagance of a perverted private judgment. And, finally, we add that no one, within its legitimate limits, more profoundly venerated the consentient teaching of the early Christian writers; the only difference with his censors being, that he did not, in common with them, hold it to be absolutely conclusive on all theological questions, or *certainly* the voice of God.

We call attention, however, to his own words on this subject, which are better than our impressions. He says, "The Church of England has preserved the golden mean between the superstitious reverence of the Romanists and the avowed contempt of the Sectarians, for the writings of the Fathers, and the authority and unimpeached tradition of the Church during the first three or four centuries." ("Aids to Reflection," p. 352.) Again, he remarks, in protesting against the license of private interpretation, "I do not mean to condemn the exercise or deny the right of individual judgment; I condemn only the pretended right of every individual, competent and incompetent, to interpret Scripture in a sense of his own, in opposition to the judgment of the Church without knowledge of the originals, &c.; and where the interpreter judges in ignorance and contempt of uninterrupted tradition and the unanimous consent of Fathers and Councils, and the universal faith of the Church in all ages. ("Aids," p. 295.)

Such were the views of Coleridge on the principle of authority. Nor did he, in any way, conflict with them, in holding that other side of the principle, which authorizes the conviction, that, since God has given to His Church the spirit of wisdom as well as the spirit of love, the mind of the Church may grow and expand in its apprehension of the truth, while its spirit remains unaltered—a conviction which can alone justify the presence of even a christianized intellect, as a searcher and debater, within the domain of Theology.

(III.) It has been also alleged, and by a quite opposite school, that Coleridge's *tone* and mode of thought tend to foster an excess of speculation on religious subjects, or, in other words, to magnify *thinking* at the expense of *believing*. This charge has assumed three separate shapes, according to the phases of the tendency to which it objects; (1.) that Coleridge claims too much room in Theology for the speculative understanding as a factor; (2.) that he deals too familiarly with the highest mysteries of religion, assuming the possibility of exhibiting them under the forms of rational conception; and (3.) that he subordinates the actual to the ideal, the objective to the

subjective. We have, here, in this threefold shape, the most forcible and weighty objection, which can be urged against him, and which, if substantially true, must render him altogether unsafe as a theologian.

Regarding this objection in the first form, viz., that he claims too much for the understanding in the sphere of Theology, we believe that, in the main, it originates in a misconception of the design of Coleridge, in nearly all his religious studies. That design was to bring out the harmony of philosophy with Religion, the ideas of the moral reason with the verities of Revelation. This necessarily led to the attempt, so far as it was practicable, not only to contemplate, but to *express* Christianity through the medium of the intellect. Obviously, there can be no theology without this; for, what else is theology but the Christian system embodied in an intellectual form. Now in carrying out such a design, the understanding must of course act a conspicuous part, for it is the faculty which organizes and defines, as well the religious, as the scientific conceptions of the mind. It was contrary to the whole tenor of Coleridge's philosophy, to encourage any usurpations on the part of this faculty. Instead of this, we find him laboring to narrow down what had been hitherto deemed its legitimate province even in theology; and to show that there are many truths consonant with, and affirmed by, the spiritual reason, or conscience, which are absolutely insusceptible of logical definition, and therefore without the province of the understanding. Among such indemonstrable truths he placed the being of God, free agency, and the life to come—the fundamental articles of Natural and Revealed Religion. It was on this very point—the limitations of demonstrative knowledge—and hence of the understanding itself, that Coleridge waged a life-long battle with the prevailing metaphysics of his day. He argued with boldness and power, that for the evidence of the verities of Religion, we must go to the affirmations of the conscience, the spiritual sense, which is common to all men, not to the conclusions of a faculty varying in all men, and in all dependant on the external senses. Zealously as he strove to bed Revelation in the rational nature, no one ever contended more stoutly for the principle, that there are many truths in the form of mysteries, which we may not conceive, that we are bound to re-ceive. This form of the objection, then, we consider groundless.

Not less so will the second form of it be found; viz., that Coleridge dealt too familiarly with the higher mysteries of the Faith, and made them too much the themes of speculation.

In proof of this, his mode of handling the doctrine of the Trinity has been particularly instanced. Now, this form of the objection has, like the other, arisen from a failure to appreciate the aim of his theological inquiries; which was to show that the service which God requires of the believing soul, is a "reasonable service." To accomplish this, he was obliged to dwell chiefly on that side of Divine Truth, which develops its coincidence with the rational nature of man. He believed faith to be the perfection of reason. Considering it "the joint efflux of reason and will," he deemed it impossible that faith should be in antagonism to a part of its own constitution. It was his conviction, furthermore, "that religion passes out of the ken of reason, only where the eye of reason has reached its own horizon, and that faith is then but its continuation."

These were the fixed principles of his Christian philosophy; and as a theologian it was at once the toil and satisfaction of his life to apply them. In the spirit of these principles he approached the mystery of the Trinity, not rashly, or with impertinent curiosity, as though it were some metaphysical riddle; but humbly, and with reverence, as being the most awful theme which could engage the human mind. The result to which his argument conducted, we care little about here. The only point of moment now, is, the *tone*—the *mode* of the argument. The only question to be decided, is, whether he was censurable in venturing at all upon the subject, or in regarding it as a legitimate theme of rational thought. We think not. We believe the Trinity to be a rational doctrine, whether it can be fully shown or not: and that its rationality, and intrinsic necessity, are, in a measure, established by the fact, that it is the only doctrine of the Divine Nature, which can successfully meet the pantheistic conception. We believe, moreover, that the wisdom of God has revealed no truth, that is not in some way related to human intelligence; and hence to some extent, a proper subject of inquiry; far less, a truth which at once underlies, and overtops the whole structure of Christianity.

It may be doubted, whether, of all the Divine Mysteries, there be one deriving so much illustration from the analogies of the natural order, as the Trinity. For since all things were made after the interior type of God's being, they must reflect that type in their own structure and operations. Scripture plainly justifies us in expecting to find, in the world and the soul of man, traces of the supreme mode of the Divine existence. To revive the forcible phraseology of the school-men, we affirm that the Trinity, instead of darkening the conception

of God, lays open his "interior respiration ;" showing us how movement is compatible with immovability, and "inegoism" with felicity. It explodes that fundamental conceit of pantheism, which alleges the impossibility of self-consciousness without limitation, and hence, without ceasing to be infinite. It explains why God was under no constraint to seek occupation in the creation and government of the universe. It flashes light on the plans of creation, even as they do, in turn, on it : while it carries us to the very root of those combinations of unity and plurality, equality, and gradation, which constitute the order of the universe. A late profound writer, in the Roman Communion, contends, that "every people ignorant of the Holy Trinity, has known God only imperfectly, and has not reached the borders of a true civilization."*

Well we know, that Coleridge finds no sanction for his attempt to argue on this mystery, among the theologians of the English Church. But, what he fails to find since the Reformation, he finds abundantly before it, and especially during the Nicene period of the Church. St. Augustine, and St. Thomas, and even Bossuet, in the seventeenth century, nowhere exhibit so grand, so acute, and impressive an intellectuality, as when discoursing on this great theme. While if we examine the religious mind of Nicene memory, we discover there no lack of evidence, that this doctrine was regarded as having a relation to human intelligence ; and if not capable of logical definition, at least as possessing such a measure of rationality, as to secure its defense against corruption. To be defended, it must be defined : but to be defined, it must exist as an idea in the orthodox mind, as well as a doctrine of Revelation. Undoubtedly, the defense of the doctrine by the Nicene Fathers rested on apostolic tradition, as grounded in God's Word. Still the subtle refinements and sharp definitions, into which they were driven, attested the liberty they indulged, in the intellectual handling of the subject. Arianism and Sabellianism gave rise to the distinctions of the Athanasian symbol. Now the old battle has been revived. That awful mystery has been again thrown into the arena of controversy. Fought out fifteen hundred years ago on the field of theology, the conflict reappears on the field of philosophy : and pantheism, wielding new weapons, occupies the old intrenchments of the foes of

* *Etudes philosophiques sur le Christianisme*, Par, Auguste Nicholas. This may seem a paradox : and yet it being once granted, that the doctrine of the Trinity is the only true exhibition of the Divine Nature, it is not difficult to see how such a conclusion might be logically and historically reached. Obviously, the highest and purest culture is possible only on the basis of correct conceptions of God.

the Ancient Church. It was under these circumstances, that Coleridge undertook the philosophical exposition of the imperiled doctrine. And the point, which we are discussing, is, not whether he succeeded, but whether the *animus* of the effort—the attempt itself—was censurable. For ourselves, we find in it no sufficient proof of a tendency to foster an undue proneness to speculation on theological themes, or to encourage thinking at the expense of believing.

There are those who would altogether exclude speculative thought from Theology, on the ground, that it has commonly proved the entering wedge of scepticism. We wonder not at the feeling, for certainly it has often, of late, cut strange antics, and shown itself a troublesome guest. But, after all, feel as we may, any such attempt to frown the speculative mind into exile from the province of religion, is idle and absurd. So long as religion addresses itself to thought, as well as faith and feeling; and so long as it includes and suggests the sublimest and most exciting themes of human contemplation, just so long will that mind claim the right to sift, measure, compare, and agitate. The only thing left us to do, is to see, that its temper be humble, docile, and reverent. In this respect we think Coleridge set an admirable example—one in which great genius was restrained by a deep sense of moral responsibility.

The third and last side of the objection we have been examining, alleges, that Coleridge subordinated the objective to the subjective, the actual to the ideal: which is equivalent to saying, that he made human reason the measure of Divine Revelation, and esteemed the moral knowledge invented by, and evolved out of, man's nature, more authoritative than that embodied in tradition, or preserved and handed on generally by external means. Now, without entering into any metaphysical discussion of the point, it is enough to say, that the charge, as a whole, is refuted, as well by the general tenor of Coleridge's religious philosophy, as by the heartiness with which he received the whole scheme of Christianity. No mind can, at the same time, hold Christianity, and such a doctrine as that above named. For Christianity is the distinct assertion of the supremacy of a divine, external tradition over human invention—of God and the universe, as objective existences over man's idea of them. Still, the allegation is not groundless. It rests on Coleridge's theory of Inspiration, as contained in his "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit." We regard this as the unsoundest portion of his writings. It is at once illogical in its structure, and dangerously loose in its tone,

—a sad memento of early errors, and of his temporary enslavement to the fascinations of German learning.

Thus far, in our view of Coleridge, as a theologian, we have sought to bring out the very *tone* and style of his thinking, esteeming this of more importance than an inquiry into his opinions on the various doctrines of Theology,—a work which has been most ably performed by the Editor of these volumes. Let us now ask not merely how he thought, but, what he did, as a theologian. On this branch of our theme, we shall be forced to be very brief. Coleridge will never be consulted on dogmatic divinity. He makes no pretension as an indoctrinator,—he claims only to be the author of a method of inquiry on theological subjects. Whatever the value of that method, it is far from representing his whole merit. Coleridge did more than teach how to approach and to handle religious topics ; he also showed how to defend them. As an apologist of Christianity, he deserves the foremost rank. In this capacity he rendered to the Faith a noble and lasting service. Having come out victoriously from his own long and agonizing search after a firm footing, amid the metaphysical ferment and turmoil of his day, he applied all the vast resources of his genius and erudition, to the defense of Religion, against the adverse intellectual tendencies of the time. He grappled with them, as one sure of the truth, conscious of the magnitude of the interest at stake, and certain of triumph. Without pretending to include all that he did as an apologist, we may safely say, that, more than any cotemporary, he contributed to enlarge, arrange, and consolidate the whole basis and structure of Christian Evidences.

(I.) He enlarged them, (1.) by substituting a spiritual for a mechanical philosophy, and by demonstrating, that with the former only could Christianity hold any fellowship ; (2.) by bringing to bear on the credibility of Revelation the previously known, and now generally admitted, principles flowing out of the distinctions between the Reason and the Understanding ;—principles, which authorize the belief, that the highest truths lie beyond the limits of Experience, and, that while incapable of logical proof, they assert their reality in the fact, that they alone constitute the possibility of Experience ;—(3.) by showing, that the Evidences cover the moral, as well as intellectual nature of man—that they rest on the triple foundations of moral intuition, logical thought, and external testimony.

(II.) He, in an eminent degree, contributed to the right arrangement of the Evidences, by demonstrating an order of

combination, which most thoroughly develops their internal harmony, and insures the greatest power of conviction. On this point, we give his own language :

" In each article of faith embraced on conviction, the mind determines, first, intuitively, on its logical possibility ; secondly, discursively, on its analogy to doctrines already believed, as well as on its correspondence to the wants and faculties of our nature; and thirdly, historically, on the direct and indirect evidences. But the probability of an event is a part of its historic evidence, and constitutes its presumptive proof, or the evidence *a priori*. Now, as the degree of evidence, *a posteriori*, requisite in order to a satisfactory proof of the actual occurrence of any fact, stands in an universe ratio to the strength or weakness of the evidence, *a priori*; (that is, a fact probable in itself may be believed on slight testimony.) it is manifest that of the three factors, by which the mind is determined to the admission or rejection of the point in question, the last, the historical, must be greatly influenced by the second, analogy, and that both depend on the first, logical congruity, not indeed, as their cause or pre-constituent, but as their indispensable condition; so that the very inquiry concerning them is preposterous, as long as the first remains undetermined."*

This weighty and pregnant passage affords a key to the true order of inquiry on any question of evidence, and especially on the Christian evidences. This order may be objected to by those who are accustomed to rely almost exclusively on external, historical proof; because it introduces this last in the series; and, generally, such persons may be led to argue that Coleridge is, for this very reason, unsound on this whole subject. But it should be observed, that though he undertakes to determine the stages in the process of inquiry, together with their order of succession, he does not undertake to decide their comparative importance, or to say, that either can be omitted, without vitiating all. He claims, and we believe wisely, that while the internal evidence is enforced and certified by the external, so in turn the external derives its credibility from the internal, and is worthless, if sundered from it. The doctrine of Coleridge assigns to outward testimony and internal evidence, " independent functions in the instruction of man; it teaches, that the former must prove religious truth, so far as it is historical and logical; that the latter must evidence it so far as it is spiritual and ideal." If he insisted upon the value of the internal, so far as to seem to undervalue the outward, it was because he foresaw a tendency which has since worked itself fully out—a tendency, namely, to neglect the former, and build only on the latter. Not the most strenuous advocate of historical, over internal evidence, ever held more devoutly than he, to Christianity, as a Gospel of facts and institutions, as well as a Gospel of doctrines and precepts.

* Volume I, Appendix E., p. 479.

(III.) But we also regard him as having contributed largely to the defense of the Faith, by consolidating the evidences. We have just seen how he developed their order of succession. In doing this, he was led to see the nature of the bond, which compacts them into a whole. This bond he taught to be nothing less than an organic relationship, in virtue of which, the separate force of each is braced by the united strength of all. Thus we have before us the truth, that even as the Christian scheme exhibits itself as a unity, flowing out of an infinite diversity; so the evidences, which authenticate its divine origin, gather themselves, by the power of organic ties and an intrinsic harmony, into a unity of testimony.

And now, omitting all else suggested by the theological aspect of Coleridge, we venture a word on the measure and tendency of his future influence. As to the former, it will be unquestionably great, though it may be unseen and unappreciated; and as to the latter, though not unmixed with elements of danger, especially to the unwary and superficial, it will just as surely be on the side of truth and righteousness. Coleridge looks to no party for favor; for, while he lived, he was above party, and now that he is dead, he is beyond it. As a theologian, he was neither High nor Low, his opinions cutting alike into the peculiar badges and tenets of both these types of churchmanship. As a philosopher, he left not, nor did he seek to leave, a school. Just as little did he care for the sharp definiteness of a logical system. Earnest and candid in the search after truth, he labored, with singleness of aim, to discover and publish those principles in the nature of man, which make him free, accountable, immortal, and capable of union with God, on the basis of a spiritual regeneration. As such, he will finally be known. As such, he now stands forth the foe of pantheism and materialism in philosophy; of rationalism in religion, and expediency in morals. As such, the great body of his thought, veined here and there with Platonic gold, and baptized in the faith of Christ, shall be joined unto the "fair humanities" of a sublime Christian culture. As such, too, his name shall mingle potentially in the deepest controversies of this and coming generations; sinking, indeed, from sight, but only as the light and the dew sink into the soil,—to reappear in the color and texture of the harvest.

ART. II.—THE HOLIDAYS.

The Book of Christmas; descriptive of the Customs, Ceremonies, Traditions, Superstitions, Fun, Feeling and Festivities of the Christmas Season. By THOMAS K. HERVEY. New York: Wiley & Putnam.

Rural Hours. By A LADY. New York: Geo. P. Putnam.

The Sketch Book of GEOFFREY CRAYON, Gent. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard.

Poems. By CLEMENT C. MOORE, LL. D. New York, 1844.

OUR present number will find our readers in the midst of the observances and enjoyments of the Christmas Season. We cannot devote a few of its pages, therefore, to any more timely subject than that which we have placed at the head of this article—THE HOLIDAYS. Mark the word we use. It is Holidays, not Holydays. Between which two things there is, to the popular ear, such an obvious distinction of meaning, that we need hardly add, our purpose is to view, not so much the strictly religious and ecclesiastical, as the more secular and social, aspects of this festive period.

Time was when, here in New England, it would have been deemed an offense, almost, to name the theme on which we now enter. By our Puritan forefathers the keeping of Christmas was prohibited by law. To attend Divine service on that day, was to incur fine or imprisonment; and who then presumed to hang up a Christmas evergreen, or wish a merry Christmas, or eat a Christmas pie and plum-pudding!

But what a change in these respects has taken place amongst us! Now, even in this land of the Pilgrims, the Anniversary of the Nativity is the chief festival of the season, and the weeks connected with it have come to be distinguished, as by common consent, “*The Holidays*.” Not only are a great number of churches open on the occasion, and the public services of religion well attended, but much of the ancient holiday spirit of the season is also exhibited. It is a time of recreation, of sports, of marriages, of visits, of feasts, of presents, and of charity. Halls of legislation are shut, and banks closed, and colleges and schools dismissed. The judge lays aside for a while his gravity and his cares; the laborer

pauses from his toils ; the sick are visited and the poor relieved, as at no other season. For weeks past bustling mothers have been putting to rights the bedrooms which their children, called home from Dr. Syntax's Academy or Madame Gracewell's Seminary, are already occupying. The shopkeepers were never so busy before : and, whatever scruples others may have against the Christmas Festival, they think it a very good thing. From their well-stored shelves Santa Claus is constantly replenishing his pouch, ready, when night falls upon the earth, to distribute his favors to all good boys and girls. The poultry-yards are emptied of their treasures ; and what preparations have been made in the kitchen ! Pies, and cakes, and puddings, and confectionery, which are likely to furnish work for the physicians, and make extra sale for their blue pills.

Happy days are these—happy not only for the young, but also for the old, who are now reviving the recollections of their youth. And sad, too, for, with every annual return of these festal hours comes back, to quote from Hervey's beautiful pages, “many a memory of sorrow as well as joy—many a scene of early love—many a merry meeting, which was yet the last—many a parting of those who shall part no more—many a joyous group, composed of materials which separated only too soon, and shall never be put together again on earth.” But still, whether sad or happy, these commemorations are, in our opinion, most salutary ; and we rejoice that Puritan prejudice has not succeeded in rooting them out of our country. We agree with the author just quoted in “loving” them, and loving them not only for their own sakes, but also “for their uses ;” and, like him, we believe that, by promoting their observance, one is doing “good and acceptable service in his generation.”

To obtain a proper view of the Christmas Holidays, and to see the ground on which rests the argument for their continuance, we must begin with the subject of Holidays in general. These may be divided into two classes. One form of them are those which, without having reference to any particular person or event, are kept arbitrarily, and simply as a means of relaxation from the drudgery and cares of life. Such are the Fairs of England and the Bull Fights of Spain, for the purpose of attending which, at their every return, the people so gladly leave their daily business ; and such were the Gladiator Exhibitions and public Games of ancient Rome and Greece, in the enjoyment of which so many thousands were stately accustomed to forget their usual toils and troubles.

To periodical amusements of various kinds man in every condition, whether savage or civilized, bond or free, instinctively inclines and invariably resorts; and they seem to be necessary for him, to relieve and cheer him under the penalties of that curse which condemned him to labor and sorrow. The statesman cannot incessantly ply his schemes, any more than the artisan his hammer; each requires an occasional day of recreation. The clergyman must have his blue Monday and a little summer trip besides; as well as the Professor and student their vacation, and the schoolboy his Saturday afternoon. It is a want in our nature. It is a part of our constitution. "All work and no play" would be nearly as pernicious as constant idleness—as to be without any occupation at all.

But the other and higher kind of Holidays are those which, while they lead to a temporary suspension of the ordinary pursuits of men, have not that for their main object, so much as the commemoration of some individual or fact. Our Fourth of July is one example: it is sacred to the memory of the nation's independence. The Twenty-Second of February is another: on it we celebrate the birth of the Father of our Country. And celebrations of this sort, too, are founded in nature. They are the instinctive promptings of our humanity. "They are," as Bishop Doane has beautifully written, "*of the heart*. In point of fact, one day is just like every other; so many hours, so many minutes, so many seconds. Arithmetic, chronometry, chronology, see just this; and no more. But now the heart comes in. This day, a year ago, made two hearts one. This day, a year ago, a first-born smiled. This day, a year ago, a mother died. What joys, what sorrows, cluster around it now! And in the calendar which the true heart preserves among its deepest folds, what light, what gloom, invests this charmed day!" Such is the origin of all anniversaries and other festivals, as well as fasts: they are the spontaneous, necessary outgrowth of the inward feelings, planted by our Maker in the very ground of our being. And hence they are found, under some form or other, wherever man is found. What individual of the human family has not his peculiar days of commemoration for private blessings or private chastisements? What household in the land has not its periodical seasons of joy or of sorrow, in remembrance of the various events with which God has been pleased to visit it? And what people so ancient or so modern, so rude or so polished, that recognizes not the same principle in their Holidays? It may be traced in the simple ceremonies of the two sons of Adam, around the

rude altar which they reared to receive the first fruits of the year ; in the Harvest Feasts of the Indians, as well as in the Thanksgiving Days of our time ; in the Elusinia and Saturnalia of heathen Greece and Rome, no less than in the Carnivals and similar festivals of Christian lands. The voyagers who have passed over waters which had never before been crossed, and lighted upon islands whose loneliness had shut them out from the knowledge and companionship of other districts of the globe, have always found there, amid those savage and secluded inhabitants, the custom of observing stated seasons in honor of departed friends or important transactions. It cannot be that a practice so prevalent, so universal, has its foundation anywhere short of the very constitution of man.

We have, however, something more definite even than the voice of nature to appeal to on this subject. The God of nature has, in the Revelation He has given us from His own mouth, approved of the principle for which we are contending. Among his chosen people of old, days of commemoration were not only allowed, but enjoined by Himself. Every seventh day the Jews were required to rest from their labors in the joy of the holy Sabbath ; and, three times each year, leaving their homes and their business, to go up to Jerusalem, from all parts of the kingdom, to keep the well-known Feasts which preserve the memory of their chief blessings. And, under the Christian covenant, the same thing has been continued. The Sabbath of the Hebrews became the Sunday of the world, the Jewish Passover the Christian Easter, Pentecost our Whitsuntide. And besides, the Church thought it only in obedience to the impulses and reverential sentiments of our nature, so often recognized and sanctioned by Divine wisdom, to appoint several other Holydays, and especially one to the honor of the birth of her Saviour, in the glory and gladness of Christmas.

This brings us to the particular institution, amid the beautiful associations of which the whole world is now rejoicing. Before, however, proceeding to speak of its peculiarities, let us look for a few moments to the influence of Holidays generally. If viewed only as resting places under the burdens of life, as breathing hours in its great race, they are time well spent. They promote health and cheerfulness, and thus tend to prolong the life and enhance the usefulness, as well as the happiness of man. But, if kept for the nobler purpose of perpetuating a remembrance of some important event or individual, as they more generally are, how much greater their uses !

In the days of Lord Eldon, for nearly twenty-five years High Chancellor of Great Britain, a club was formed by the admirers of the younger Pitt, then departed this life, and which met on every anniversary of his birthday. Eldon became a member, and at one of the meetings, when old and gray headed and venerable for his wisdom, gave the following reasons why he considered it his duty to attend as long as life and strength were continued to him.

"In the first place," he said, "personal gratitude to the great man, whose memory and principles the club was intended to commemorate, had influenced his mind. In the next place, judging not as a mere individual, but as a member of that great Society in which they were all enrolled, he felt it to be his duty to endeavor to maintain the principles, from the operation of which the country had derived such essential benefits. But a still more important reason had determined him in forming the resolution he had adopted. He regarded meetings of that sort—meetings which paid an honorable homage to patriotic exertions and superior virtue—as calculated to work a great public good. They were not only a just tribute to preëminent services, but they roused the emulation of young men, (who, perhaps, but for them would have remained in ignorance upon the subject,) when they witnessed such noble and generous scenes as some had witnessed that day, perhaps for the first time. He would ask was it possible for any one possessed of generous feelings, to be present on such an occasion, to see the fervent manner in which the remembrance of the services and the genius and the lofty virtues of the illustrious deceased were held, and not be better from witnessing such a scene? If called upon to discharge a public duty, would he not proceed to it with increased vigor and a determination to emulate, in as far as possible, the conduct of that great man, whose name would descend from generation to generation, he most sincerely hoped, as long as England should exist."*

These remarks may be applied to all commemorative festivals, and set forth very clearly and fully the reasons for their observance. How much, for instance, do we promote a regard for the principles, and an imitation of the example of Washington, by keeping one day every year in honor of his birth; and what a new impulse is given to the spirit of patriotism and a love for our national union, by every anniversary in memory of our country's independence! And why may not similar influences flow from the Christmas Holidays; and who can doubt that they are fruitful to promote an attachment to that religion from which they date their origin, and to its Divine Founder? If not a proper respect for Him, at least a sense of the good effects they produce, should make us anxious for their continuance.

Of their beneficial tendency and excellent moral uses, however, we shall not have a complete idea unless we view them in their social bearings. They bring together people from different places, thus promoting, what is of incalculable value, a community of feeling and of interest; and they re-

* Twiss' Life of Lord Eldon, vol. 2, p. 204.

assemble neighbors, and if any little misunderstanding or coolness has sprung up between them, cause it to be forgotten, and so restore once more mutual harmony and peace. "How many families," says Dickens, in his inimitable way, "whose members have been dispersed and scattered far and wide in the restless struggles of life, are then reunited, and meet once again, in that happy state of companionship and mutual good will, which is a source of such pure and unalloyed delight, and one so incompatible with the cares and sorrows of the world, that the religious belief of the most civilized nations, and the rude traditions of the roughest savages alike number it among the first joys of a future state of existence, provided for the blest and happy." No one, however, has written on the sweet, domestic influence of the Holidays, so genially as Mr. Irving; and we believe our own practice is that of many, never to let the present season pass by without reading over again his delightful chapters on the subject in the "Sketch Book." We love to take our seat with him in that English coach, and hear those happy school-boys, going home for the holidays with their pockets full of presents for their little sisters, talk over the anticipated pleasure of seeing them and their mother, and their pet dogs and pony. We keep on to the Hall, and there witness the greeting between young Frank Bracebridge and his family, and the Yule log burning in the wide fire-place, and the dog on the rug, and the old Squire in his elbow-chair, as the center of the scene. The sweet converse that Christmas Eve, and the family prayers next morning, and the going to church, and the sermon by the parson, and Master Simon repeating the responses and joining in the musical part of the services, these and other descriptions bring before us not only a happy time, but one also replete in pure and holy influences; and while listening to old Mr. Bracebridge's lament over the decline which his day presented to the greater mirth and cheer of former times, we find ourselves regretting that our own country does not retain more of the holiday spirit which yet lingers in England. Still, American homes are not wholly wanting in this respect; and many of us can respond to the experience uttered by one of our native poets:

"In all my wanderings through this vale of tears,
From infancy to manhood's riper years;
Whatever pains assailed or griefs oppressed,
Christmas and New Year always saw me blest.
A lengthened absence o'er, how pleasant then,
To meet the friends dearest loved again,
Grasp the warm hand, or share the fond embrace,

And see new smiles lit up in every face.
'Twas Christmas Eve ! The supper board was spread,
The fire blazed high, with logs of hickory fed ;
The candles, too, unusual lustre lent,
Candles expressly made for this event.
Old tales were told, the cheerful joke went round,
While peals of laughter made the cot resound.
A thousand welcomes hailed the truant boy,
And swift the moments flew on wings of joy ;
Till (as they thought, too soon) the hour of prayer
Bade the young urchins to their beds repair.
But first, the stocking from each little leg
Must be suspended to a hook or peg,
That Santa Claus, who travels all the night,
Might, in the dark, bestow his favors right.
These rights observed, they take a parting kiss,
And go to dream of morning's promised bliss !
Thus did a week of festive pleasures roll,
Till New Year's happy morning crown'd the whole."

But these pleasant pictures introduce us into the midst of the scenes of the present festal season, and of these we must now take a more special view. The Christmas Holidays, as we observe them in this country, are derived chiefly from our English ancestors, with a considerable mixture, in the State of New York particularly, of the Dutch element. Strictly speaking, they begin on the 24th of December, the eve of the Nativity, and end on Epiphany, or Twelfth Day, the 6th of January, these embracing about twelve days, New Year's being the center. What gives them their chief interest and great prominence over all similar occasions is, that they cluster around that great event, the greatest in the annals of time, the advent and birth of the Babe of Bethlehem, the Son of God and yet the Son of Man, the Saviour of the world. It should be the remembrance of Him and of the blessings, temporal as well as spiritual, which he brought down to us, that animates these happy hours. And they should take their tone and spirit from His religion, which, as was its Divine Author, is found at the supper-board and marriage feast, as well as in the house of mourning and beside the bed of sickness and death ; which not only kneels at the altar, but presides also at the hearth ; which despises not the grace and beauty and courtesy of life, any more than its sterner realities ; which takes not away our joys and pleasures, but exalts and sanctifies them ; which hallows the merry laugh and blesses those simple amusements which make the heart cheerful and glad ; which encourages us to seek the society of dear friends, and to surround ourselves at proper seasons, with those whom we love and by whom we are loved in return.

But, though the peculiar religious associations of these

Holidays give to them most of their charm, yet, as has often been remarked, they owe much of their influence to the season of the year in which they occur. We do not keep them in the warm and sunny months, but now in the heart of winter, when every thing else is cold and gloomy. The world without presents such a desolate appearance, that we gladly resort to the blessings spared to us within doors. The wide contrast between the severities of external nature and the comforts to be had by the cheerful fireside and in the happy family circle, gives to these domestic pleasures a sweeter taste, and makes us partake of them with a keener relish. Winter, too, is a period of more than ordinary leisure, especially in rural districts ; and therefore, many can now have the opportunity of keeping this festival, who at other seasons would be debarred the privilege. Hence somebody has said, and said with as much truth as force, that it is to be doubted whether Christmas would be Christmas at any other time, and we are quite sure that, without it, the rugged winter could hardly be endured. And besides, if it did not come now, when there is snow on the ground, we might be obliged to dispense with so important a part of its holidays as Santa Claus and his presents ; for that venerable old gentleman, if we may believe Professor Moore, "who has seen him nearer than most people,"* travels in a miniature sleigh "with eight tiny rein-deer."

"Now Dasher, now Dancer! now Prancer, now Vixen !
 On Cupid, on Comet ! On Donder and Blitzen !
 To the top of the porch ! to the top of the wall !
 Now dash away, dash away, dash away all !
 As dry leaves, that before the wild hurricane fly,
 When they meet with an obstacle mount to the sky ;
 So up to the house-top the coursers they flew,
 With the sleigh full of toys, and St. Nicholas too ;
 And then in a twinkling I heard on the roof,
 The pawing and prancing of each little hoof."

Of Santa Claus, who he is and what is his history, we shall have more to say before concluding ; but first we must speak of some things which generally precede his appearance on Christmas Eve. One of these are the evergreens. We find them, as soon as the Holidays come around, not only going up in the Church, but also surmounting the doors and pictures in many a private house. The custom is very ancient ; and those who are curious to see all the information which exists with regard to its origin and history must consult Mr. Hervey's Book. Some, he tells us, trace it to those figura-

* See *Rural Hours*, p. 436.

tive expressions in the Prophets which speak of the Messiah as the "Branch of Righteousness," and describe, by natural allusions, the fertility which should attend His coming. "The Lord shall comfort Zion," says Isaiah; "He will comfort all her waste places and He will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord." Again: "The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir-tree, the pine-tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of my sanctuary; and I will make the place of my feet glorious." Others think the practice was taken from the Evangelist's account of Christ's entry into Jerusalem, when the multitude "cut down branches and strewed them in the way." But it is sufficient to say that such decorations are suggested by the season of the year. When all is barren and desolate without, it is natural to desire something green and lively within.

"The thickly woven boughs they wreath
Through every hallowed fane,
A soft reviving odor breathe
Of Summer's gentle reign."*

Another custom, very common in the old Christian countries, and not entirely unknown among us, is that of singing carols in the streets and beneath the windows on Christmas Eve. Children especially have been wont to go about for this purpose, and, with glad voices, to hail the advent of their Redeemer, and congratulate their friends and neighbors on the happy occasion. The practice is of very early date, and mingled with the observances of the primitive Church. Bishop Taylor beautifully speaks of the *Gloria in Excelsis*—the well known hymn sung by the angels to the shepherds on the night of our Lord's nativity—as the first Christmas carol. In Mr. Hervey's volume we find the subsequent history of the custom traced down with no little learning and minuteness, and also its different peculiarities described as it has prevailed in both Papal and Protestant countries, as well as many curious specimens of these songs. Some of them have come to be among the most valued "spiritual songs" adopted from time to time by the Church; and they form a very important branch of the highly interesting subject of Christian Hymnology.

Of the old popular legends and superstitions connected with this season, and adding so much to the interest of its holidays, we come next to speak. In some parts of England there formerly prevailed a notion that, on the eve of Christmas, the

* Dr. William Croswell.

oxen were to be found kneeling in their stalls, as if in adoration of the nativity. In other parts of the world it has been believed that bees sing in their hives on the midnight preceding the Saviour's coming. And we are all familiar with what Shakspeare says in regard to the effect which this event has upon chanticleer, which is "the trumpet of the morn," and "doth with his lofty and shrill-sounding throat awake the god of day."

" Some say, that ever 'gainst that season comes
 Wherein our Saviour's birth is celebrated,
 This bird of dawning singeth all night long ;
 And then, they say, no spirit dares stir abroad ;
 The nights are wholesome ; then no planets strike,
 No fairy takes, nor witch hath power to charm,
 So hallowed and so gracious is the time."

To these and other well-known fables, Mr. Hervey adds several which we have never seen before. One of them, derived from a traveler in Canada, is interesting. He mentions meeting an Indian, at midnight, creeping cautiously along in the stillness of a beautiful moonlight Christmas Eve. The Indian made signals for him to be silent ; and, when questioned as to his reason, replied, " We watch to see the deer kneel ; this is Christmas night, and all the deer fall upon their knees to the Great Spirit, and look up."

But these, and many similar superstitions, once so deeply seated in the popular mind of Christendom, have all faded away before the incredulous and unimaginative spirit of our times. Not so, however, with the kindred tradition of Santa Claus. The notion that he goes around with his presents during this holiday season is still cultivated almost as carefully as when, more than two centuries ago, he began to drive his fairy steeds up the steep roofs of the Dutch settlers of New Amsterdam. Now, people in all parts of our country, if they do not believe in his existence, still seem to expect a share in the distribution of his favors. No sooner is one set of children old enough to have the mystery and charm connected with his name dissolved, than another generation arises to renew its interest and power. Anciently he came down the big Dutch chimneys. Some years ago people began to turn the old fashioned fireplaces into grates ; but still this favorite visitor continued to make his appearance, though it must have been tight squeezing through the diminished flues. And now his path is everywhere contracted into a four or six inch stove-pipe, and yet he persists in finding his way down into the nursery and parlor with his pouch and all. Ever since our boyish days, when so much of the happiness of the whole year was

bound up in the Christmas visits of this patron saint, we have been curious to obtain a well-authenticated account of his pedigree and life. But we have never seen anything more satisfactory than what has been recently collected in one of the volumes named above, "Rural Hours, by a Lady." The authoress is understood to be the daughter of the late James Fennimore Cooper, and surely her book is worthy of such a relationship. It is one which, for its correct tone of moral and religious sentiment, and its harmony with true Catholic theology and piety, we would most heartily recommend. And, by the way, there could not be a better holiday present, especially the edition which is embellished by a series of finely-colored illustrations; and we hope many of our booksellers have it ready for Santa Claus. Speaking of this old Dutch Saint, Miss Cooper says:—

"Most of the wisest people in the land know little more about Santa Claus than the children. There is a sort of vague, moonlight mystery still surrounding the real identity of the old worthy. Most of us are satisfied with the authority of pure, unalloyed tradition, going back to the burghers of New Amsterdam, more especially now that we have the portrait by Mr. Weir, and the verses of Professor Moore, as confirmation of nursery lore. It is only here and there that one finds a ray of light falling upon something definite. We are told, for instance, that there was, many hundred years ago, in the age of Constantine, a saintly Bishop by the name of Nicholas, at Patara, in Asia Minor, renowned for his piety and charity. In the course of time some strange legends sprang up concerning him; among other acts of mercy, he was supposed to have restored to life two lads who had been murdered by their treacherous host, and it was probably owing to this tradition that he was considered the especial friend of children. When the Dominican fraternity arose, about 1200, they selected him as their patron saint. He was also—and is, indeed, to this day—held in great honor by the Greek Church in Russia. He was considered as the especial patron of scholars, virgins and seamen. Possibly it was through some connection with this last class that he acquired such influence in the nurseries of Holland. Among that nautical race, the patron saint of sea-faring men must have been invoked, before the Reformation, by the wives and children of those who were far away on the stormy seas of Africa and the Indies. The festival of St. Nicholas fell on the 6th of December, but a short time before Christmas. It seems that the Dutch Reformed Church engaged in a revision of the Calendar, at the time of the Reformation, by a regular court, examining the case of each individual canonized by the Church of Rome, something in the way of the usual proceedings at a canonization by that Church. The claims of the individual to the honors of a Saint were advanced on one hand, and opposed on the other. It is said that, wherever they have given a decision, it has always been against the claimant. But in number of instances, they have left the case still open to investigation to the present hour, and among other cases of this kind stands that of *Sanctus Klaas*, or St. Nicholas. In the meantime, until the question should be finally settled, his anniversary was to be kept in Holland, and the children, in the little hymn they used to sing in his honor, were permitted to address him as '*goedi keyligh man*'—good holy man. It appears that it was not so much at Christmas, as on the eve of his own festival, that he was supposed to drive his wagon over the roofs, and down the chimneys to fill people's stockings. * * * * *

"Strange indeed has been the two-fold metamorphosis undergone by the pious, ancient Bishop of Patara. We have every reason to believe that there once lived a saintly man of that name and charitable character, but, as in many other

cases, the wonders told of him by the monkish legends are too incredible to be received upon the evidence which accompanies them. Then later, in a day of revolutions, we find every claim disputed, and the pious, Asiatic Bishop appears before us no longer a Bishop, no longer an Asiatic, no longer connected with the ancient world, but a sturdy, kindly, jolly old Burgher of New Amsterdam, half Dutchman, half 'spook.' The legend-makers of the cloister on the one hand, the nurses and gossips of Dutch nurseries, black and white, on the other, have made strange work of it. It would be difficult to persuade the little people now that Santa Claus ever had a real existence; and yet, perhaps, we ought to tell them that there was once a saintly man of that name, who did many such good deeds as all Christians are commanded to do, works of love and mercy. At present they can only fancy Santa Claus as Mr. Moore has seen him, in those pleasant, funny verses which are so highly relished in the nurseries:—

' His eyes, how they twinkled ! His dimples, how merry !
His cheeks were like roses—his nose like a cherry ;
His droll little mouth was drawn up like a bow,
And the beard on his chin was as white as the snow.
The stump of a pipe he held tight in his teeth,
And the smoke it encircled his head like a wreath.
He had a broad face, and a little round belly,
That shook, when he laughed, like a bowl full of jelly.'"

But from Santa Claus himself, let us now turn for a moment to the presents he brings and other gifts of the season. These are now passing between the different members of a family, and from friend to friend, and from neighbor to neighbor, tokens of remembrance and signs of love and good will. It would be in vain to seek for the origin of the custom. In the old and merry days of England, it prevailed most extensively. Then the nobility were expected to send a handsome present to the King, which he reciprocated by something generally of less value. The wardrobe and jewelry of Queen Elizabeth, were principally supplied by these annual contributions. The fashion was kept up by her successors till the reign of George the Third. The only remnant of it at the English court now is, that the two chaplains, in waiting on New Year's day, have each a crown-piece laid under their plates at dinner. But though no longer sanctioned by formal royal observance, the custom still prevails everywhere in England, from the mansions of the great, to the cottages of the peasantry. Not so extensively, however, as in France. There no person able to give, pays a visit on the first day of January, empty handed ; and carriages may be seen rolling through the streets of Paris, laden with *bon-bons* and *souvenirs*. Nor is it a useless ceremony. Much moral good may be accomplished by it. When Bishop Latimer sent to Henry the Eighth a New Testament, at this season, richly illuminated, it was with a leaf conspicuously doubled down at a text, of the intended application of which the royal sensualist was but too conscious. The poet Southey's New Year's gift to his daughter Edith, was once a Bible,

accompanied by a beautiful letter, in which he expressed the hope, "that with the new year she would begin the custom of reading, morning and night, the Psalms and Lessons for the day."* But the most appropriate presents for the season are those for the poor. Let their hearts thus be made to sing for joy, and to give praise and adoration to the Giver of all good gifts.

Similar remarks may be applied to the New Year's visits which occur in the midst of their holiday season. It is a practice hallowed by time, and sanctioned by its salutary influences. It brings together long-separated and often long-estranged friends ; it tightens the bonds of society, and heals its wounds ; it is, in short, a social, pleasant, and useful custom, and as such it may well be respected and cherished. Let the children, too, have their share in it. Give them a present for their New Year's call and New Year's wish. It costs but little, and will buy much, even the good will of those little ones, and the approbation of our own hearts in having contributed to their mirth and happiness.

After these annual calls are made, the Christmas holidays in this country, are about over ; though in England, as we have said, they are prolonged until Epiphany, or the 6th of January, the day of Christ's manifestation to the Gentiles, in the persons of the Wise Men of the East, and prolonged with many singular observances which we have not space to notice. But even as the happy season terminates among us, what a lengthened festival it has been ! This, in fact, is one of the chief excellencies of it, that it has been long enough to give opportunities of enjoyment to all classes of the community, and each member of the household. Not only has the owner had his period of recreation, but the clerk too ; the servant took a day of leisure as well as the master, the maid as well as her mistress ; the husband has found time perhaps to meet his friends, and the wife hers ; and the children† have had their chance quite as much as the old folks. How happy has every one been made, and what a pleasant remembrance is left of the past ! "Regrets there will, no doubt, in most cases

* See Southey's Life and Correspondence, edited by his son, p. 419. The whole letter is worth reading, as is every thing in that most interesting and instructive volume.

† The children's day is most appropriately the Feast of the Holy Innocents, which, by a very beautiful arrangement, falls on Christmas week, December 28. After taking them to church, and letting them hear there, in the Gospel for the day, the story of the martyred children of Bethlehem and its coasts, then be careful at home, in every proper way, to deepen within their minds an affectionate remembrance of the Saviour and of that religion which has done so much for all, from "the least to the greatest."

be ; for these distant and periodical gatherings together of families, but show more prominently the blanks which the long intervals have created ; this putting on anew, as it were, of the garment of love, but exposes the rents which time has made since it was last worn ; this renewing of the chain of our attachments, but displays the links that are broken !** But even such lessons are wholesome to be learned. Bitter as they are to the taste, they will purify and make better the man who " inwardly digests them."

Let it not be thought then, that these holidays are days thrown away. That they may be abused, is true ; that they are often attended with excess and other evils, we admit. But what good institution is not liable to the same objections ? We believe that, after all has been said against them which can be said, there is still a large balance of argument in their favor. It is extremely desirable, therefore, to see them continued, especially in a country which has so few other similar institutions compared with older countries. England and France probably have a dozen to our one. The ancient Athenians had upwards of eighty days which they regularly devoted to amusements and merry-makings every year. And the ancient Jews, God's favorite nation and acting under His special directions, uniformly kept as holidays, twelve days, one for each new moon ; seven as the Feast of the Passover ; seven as the Pentecost ; one for the great day of the Atonement, and eight as the Feast of the Tabernacles, making in all thirty-five days annually, or nearly one tenth of the whole time, to say nothing of the weekly Sabbath. Then they had their Sabbatical Year, one in every seven, when no tillage was allowed, the corn fields were neither sown nor reaped, the vines were unpressed, and there were no grapes gathered, slaves were

* Hervey. His words remind us of a touching passage which Lockhart gives from the Diary of Sir Walter Scott, than whom none was ever more fond of the Holidays. These he generally tried to spend among his nearest and best-beloved friends. But now, in 1826, he had outlived his wife and most of the companions of his youth. The Christmas of that year, however, found him at Abbotsford, making an effort to collect around him the remnants of former times. His well-known neighbors, the Fergusons, of Huntly Burn, were there ; and they had the usual appliances of mirth and good cheer. Yet the party, he complains, like the chariot wheels of Pharaoh in the Red Sea, dragged heavily. He adds :—

" It must be allowed that the regular recurrence of annual festivals among the same individuals has, as life advances, something in it that is melancholy. We meet like survivors of some perilous expedition, wounded and weakened ourselves, and looking through diminished ranks to think of those who are no more. Or they are like the feasts of the Caribs, in which they held that the pale and speechless phantoms of the deceased appeared and mingled with the living. Yet where shall we fly from vain repining !—or why should we give up the comfort of seeing our friends because they can no longer be to us, or we to them, what we once were to each other ?"

manumitted, and the whole people were given up to recreation and enjoyment. And besides, they observed every fiftieth year as the grand Jubilee, at the commencement of which the glad sound of trumpets proclaimed liberty throughout the land ; all old debts were canceled, hired as well as bond servants were set free, and the inheritances which had been alienated reverted to their original proprietors ; during all which period, as in the Sabbatical Year, no servile work was to be performed, the land was to remain fallow, and its spontaneous produce belonged to the poor and needy. Such a large proportion of their time did the Almighty think it profitable for the Hebrew people to spend in relaxation and good fellowship, notwithstanding the many ways in which the privilege was doubtless perverted. Let these facts be remembered by all who are disposed to grudge us Christmas and New Year, or any other of our few national holidays. Let those days be well understood and well spent, and they cannot but be agreeable to God, as well as promotive of immense good. None need them more than Americans, for none are so deeply absorbed in work and the pursuit of gain. Labor, business, money-getting, these are followed almost incessantly, from morning till night, from one end of the year till the other. From such intense straining of the system there must be more relaxation, or it will snap asunder or be weakened. "Some," writes Southe, "reproach the Catholic religion with the number of its holy-days, never considering how the want of holidays breaks down and brutalizes the laboring class, and that where they seldom occur, they are uniformly abused." The excess and riot run into by our over-worked population on the few holidays we now have, is an argument for the increase, rather than for the diminution of the number. "The abuse springs from the non-use," as is forcibly observed by Lord John Manners, the well-known advocate of the recreations of the poorer classes of England. Let us, then, have more such seasons, and they will be better kept ; and when well kept, they will be found among our choicest blessings. But curses, instead of blessings, must they prove to any nation or any individual that makes them occasions of intemperance and debauchery, instead of moderate hilarity and sober, refined enjoyment.

May not such be the case with any of our readers who are permitted to see another return of the present happy Christmas season. When it shall be all over, may none of us find reason to blush for a single impropriety which it has witnessed. Let it leave us this year, as ever, not only happier, but better for its associations, its amusements, and its pleasures.

ART. III.—BISHOP GOBAT.

Memorial to the Oriental Patriarchs, &c.

Reply of the Committee of the Jerusalem Diocesan Fund.

Southgate's Visit to the Syrian (Jacobite) Church of Mesopotamia. New York, 1844.

Patterson's Tour in Egypt, Palestine, Syria and Greece. London, 1852.

Bishop Gobat's Journey in Abyssinia. New York, 1850.

IN 1841, the then Archbishop of Canterbury, having consulted the Bishops, who attended the Convocation in August of that year, proceeded to exercise the power vested in him by consecrating the Rev. Michael Solomon Alexander, a Bishop, to reside at Jerusalem, and to perform such duties as should be specified. The proposition to establish the Bishopric, was first made to the English government by the King of Prussia, who proposed to the English government the foundation of a Bishopric at Jerusalem, which should serve as a protector and common centre to the various Protestant communities existing in the Turkish dominions. At the same time, as the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, was already "in possession of an ecclesiastical foundation on Mount Zion," the King considered "it to be the duty of all evangelical princes and communities to join this foundation," and promised that he would allow "the clergy and missionaries of his National Church, * * * * * to unite themselves with it; and for this purpose to obtain for themselves Episcopal ordination." A concordat was therefore entered into, by which the appointment of the Bishop was vested alternately in the Archbishop of Canterbury and the King of Prussia—the nominee of the latter being subject to the Archbishop's veto—and Dr. Alexander, a converted Jew, received the first appointment, and went to Palestine, bearing with him letters commendatory to the Eastern Patriarchs.

It was hoped that this joint mission by the two Protestant governments, besides its results in the East, might have another reflective tendency; that it might serve to unite the Prussians and the English in closer religious concord; and lead the former to accept from the latter, an Episcopal ministry.

of which they had been deprived at the Reformation. Others, again, saw in the formation of this alliance, a temporizing policy, a sacrifice of principle from which, in the outset, they forbode nothing but disaster.

The London Missionary Society, also, which was prosecuting a Mission to the Jews in Palestine, entered warmly into the movement; and it is said, looked for the establishment of a Jewish Christian Church in Jerusalem.

Upon the death of Bishop Alexander, Dr. Gobat was nominated to the Episcopate of Jerusalem. This gentleman, Samuel Gobat, was born, January 26, 1799, at Cremine, a small village in the Canton of Berne, Switzerland, then under the French government. His parents were Protestants. In the year 1821, he entered the Missionary Institution at Basle; an Institution which was erected and opened in 1816, by the City, as a monument to commemorate its deliverance from threatened destruction, in the border wars of the French on the one side, and the Austrians and the Russians on the other, in the summer of 1815. He remained in that Institution till the autumn of 1823; when he passed a year in Paris, in studying Arabic. In 1825, he passed several months in London, and was sent thence to Abyssinia, as their Missionary, by the English Church Missionary Society. He entered Abyssinia in 1830, and finally left it in 1836, in consequence of protracted ill health. Unable to return to Abyssinia, in the early part of the winter of 1839-40, he went to Malta, to superintend the publication of the Holy Scriptures in the Arabic and other oriental languages; where he remained for nearly six years. In 1845, he was admitted to Deacon's Orders in the English Church; but being suspected of a leaning towards the Monophysite heresy, he was obliged to make a formal profession of the Faith, before the Bishop of London would consent to ordain him Priest. In 1846, Frederick William IV, King of Prussia, nominated him as second Bishop of Jerusalem, and he was consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, though the Bishop of Exeter protested earnestly against his consecration. He is represented as a man of ardent religious feeling, and of great energy of character. He speaks eight or ten different languages fluently.

Up to almost the present time, the Episcopate at Jerusalem had failed to accomplish the objects for which it was mainly established. The Protestant Missionaries from America, though glad enough to avail themselves of the protection of the British government in the East, have been very careful to avoid the Bishop's influence and authority. The Jews, so far

from being reached by the Mission, have hardly been affected by it; converts from them, it is said, scarcely numbering one a year. And as for the Prussians being converted to Episcopacy through the influence of the Jerusalem Episcopate, we suppose that idea has by this time been abandoned.

Recently, however, matters in the East have assumed a new aspect; and we seem now to be opening a new Chapter in its History. The spirit of enquiry which is kindling up throughout those regions, and not least of all in the Eastern Churches; the acknowledged failure of all past attempts to reach those decayed Churches through their spiritual guides and teachers, have seemed to Bishop Gobat to open a new avenue of activity, which he has proceeded to enter. The Church Missionary Society has now forced upon itself the alternative, either to withdraw entirely from the field, giving it up to the Missionaries of Rome or of Dissent, or else to appeal at once to the enquiring masses of the people, who are waiting to receive its instructions. It has chosen the latter. And the following will show that something has already been done:

Extract from an Encyclical of Bishop Samuel Gobat, Successor of the late Bishop Michael Alexander.

[Printed in the *Jewish Intelligencer* of January, 1852.]

"Samuel, by Divine permission, Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland at Jerusalem, to all the brethren, who in every place call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and especially to those whose hearts' desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they may be saved; Grace, mercy, and peace be multiplied. * * * * *

"The power of darkness is displaying an activity altogether frightful, to prevent the light of the Gospel from penetrating *into this dark abode of superstition and worldliness.* * * * * *

"This Bible Reader has been the means of exciting a spirit of research *amongst a good number of Priests*; but they are so strictly watched that it would not be prudent to enter into any details, except that latterly one, a young man, who *began to show his attachment to the Gospel*, has been suddenly removed to some confinement hitherto unknown to me.

"The third Scripture reader, Michael, has been engaged for some time in the spring in visiting the low country, Ramlah, Lidd, and Jaffa; but there he found a *strong opposition* to the Gospel, people afraid of one another and *of their Priests*, did not dare to speak to him. *He could, however, collect a few* in some retired places, when he learned that a good number of persons are secretly reading the word of God. He has spent several summer months at Nazareth. He could not visit Salt on account of the disturbances which have scattered our friends of Salt into the mountains.

"Although the general movement mentioned in my two last letters has considerably subsided, yet there is a door open in this country for preaching the Gospel to the natives; and I am most thankful to state that the Church Missionary Society have resolved to send missionaries into this open field of labor. One, the Rev. Mr. Klein, has been already two months occupied in learning the first rudiments of the language, previous to *his settling as pastor of the Protestant community of Nazareth*. Another is expected here in a few days, who, being well acquainted with *modern Greek* and *Turkish*, will in the first place labor among

the thousands of *ignorant pilgrims who yearly visit Jerusalem*. Here, in Jerusalem, there are many Latins, Greeks, and Armenians, who more or less earnestly seek the truth; but they are almost all poor, and their dependence on the convents is to them a formidable obstacle, *for when any one begins seriously to read the Bible, or sends his children to my school, or attends the Bible and Prayer meeting in Arabic, (in Michael's house,) he is at once ordered by his Priest to desist*; and if he does not immediately submit, he is driven out of his dwelling, belonging generally to a convent. Thus latterly two families, belonging formerly to the Latins, were at once driven, or were rather thrown out of their dwellings, because they would not give up their Bibles to be burnt. When thus driven out of their lodgings for the word of God's sake, which we endeavor to preach and to spread, *it would be too cruel not to provide houses for them*, although they may not yet have given proof of a thorough conversion of heart. *I therefore generally pay house-rent for them*, as long as they do well and need my help.

"With respect to Nablous, it would require volumes to relate all the intrigues, bribes, repeated promises, and threatenings, which the *bishops and monks of the Greek convent here have employed, in order to stop and to destroy, if possible, the good work going on at Nablous, on the one hand; and on the other hand the simplicity and good sense and superior wisdom, with which it has been given the Evangelical Christians to stand their ground, and to baffle all the cunning and efforts of their opponents.*"

"In consequence of the tyranny and persecution formerly exercised at Nazareth against those who read the Bible, *about twenty families have been led to leave their churches and constitute themselves into a Protestant community, now recognized and protected by Government as such. This step was PREMATURE, and I do not wish to convey the idea that those Protestants are really converted persons.* The Rev. Mr. Bowen, of the Church Missionary Society, has spent some months this summer in Nazareth, and finds that there is a great mixture of pure and spurious motives at work among them; but yet he is convinced that there are individuals who really seek the saving truth, and, *at any rate, there is a good opportunity for preaching the Gospel in Galilee.*"

"Finally, beloved brethren, I thank all those of you who have hitherto helped and supported us by your prayers, your advice, and your money, to carry on the work intrusted to us, especially the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, and the Church Missionary Society.

"And commanding myself and fellow-laborers, both lay and clerical, together with all the subjects mentioned above, to your intercessory prayers,

"I remain, your humble servant and brother,
S. ANGL. HIEROSOL."

The results of Bishop Gobat's labors in leading to this secession of Oriental Christians from the Oriental Churches, have led to a new demonstration in England, which is just now attracting much attention; as the following Memorial in opposition to the Mission, shows:

"SACKVILLE COLLEGE, East Grinstead, September 9, 1853.

"REV. SIR.—The undermentioned clergymen have formed themselves into a committee, with power to add to their number, for the purpose of circulating among the clergy, and obtaining signatures to, the enclosed memorial to the Oriental Patriarchs on the subject of the proselytizing practices of Bishop Gobat at Jerusalem. Your own signature, and any others that you may be able to procure, are earnestly requested. Should you be desirous of receiving any more copies of the protest, they shall be forwarded to you at once. It will be sufficient to authorize me to affix any name, specifying whether of a priest or deacon, as all the names must be engrossed on parchment before transmission. Requesting an early answer,

"I remain, Reverend Sir, your faithful servant,

"J. M. NEALE."

" Rev. W. H. Mill, D. D., Brasted, Sevenoaks; Ven. Archdeacon Denison, East Brent, Weston-super-Mare; Ven. Archdeacon Wilberforce, Burton Agnes, Hull; Rev. E. B. Pusey, D. D., Christ Church, Oxford; Very Rev. the Provost of S. Ninian's, Perth; Rev. C. C. Bartholomew, S. David's, Exeter; Rev. T. Chamberlain, Christ Church, Oxford; Rev. J. H. Copeland, Farnham, Bishops Stortford; Rev. C. A. Fowler, Crawley, Sussex; Rev. W. Gresley, Brighton; Hon. and Rev. F. R. Grey, Morpeth; Rev. W. H. Joyce, Dorking; Rev. J. Keble, Hursley, Winchester; Rev. R. T. Low, Lea, Gainsborough; Rev. W. W. Malet, Ardeley, Buntingford; Rev. C. Marriott, Oriel College, Oxford; Rev. M. W. Mayow, Market Lavington, Wilts; Rev. J. M. Neale, Sackville College, East Grinstead; Rev. H. Newland, Westbourne, Emsworth; Rev. J. Oldknow, Bordesley, Birmingham; Rev. W. Pound, Malton; Rev. Sir G. Prevost, Bart, Stinchcombe, Dursley; Rev. W. Scott, Christ Church, Hoxton; Rev. A. Watson, S. Marychurch, Torquay; Rev. B. Webb, Sheen, Ashbourne; Rev. George Williams, S. Columba's College, Ireland; Rev. Isaac Williams, Stinchcombe, Dursley; Rev. Cecil Wray, S. Martin's, Liverpool."

PROTEST.

" To the Most Holy Lord *Anthimus*, Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch:—and

" To the Most Holy Lord *Hierotheus*, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria, and Ecumenical Judge:—and

" To the Most Holy Lord Patriarch of Antioch, and of all the East:—and

" To the Most Holy *Cyril*, Patriarch of the Holy City of Jerusalem, and of all Palestine:—and

" To the Most Holy Governor Synod of all the Russias:—and

" To the Holy Synod of the Kingdom of Greece:

" The undersigned Bishops, Priests, and Deacons of the Catholic Church in England and Scotland, greeting in the Lord:

" The Unity of the faith, most holy fathers in Christ, which binds together in one the different branches of the Holy Catholic Church, renders it also necessary that, as the Apostle says, 'If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it.' But the suffering, when brother gives occasion of scandal to brother, becomes much more grievous. And such is our case at the present time. For although some of you so ignore the Church which is in England, as not even to acknowledge her baptism, yet this does not prevent us from sympathizing in a brotherly manner with you, for the scandals that have been excited by us in the East. For we are by no means disposed, when injured, to retaliate by injury, but rather as Christians and Catholics to return good for evil.

" It is necessary, therefore, to give a brief summary of what has occurred, that, frankly confessing the offense, we may clearly show our own blamelessness, and render our defense more easy to be understood. For he verily is guilty of grievous sin who rends the seamless coat of Christ.

" In the year, then, of our Lord, 1841, it seemed good to the Most Reverend Father in God, William, at that time by Divine permission Metropolitan of the Holy Church of Canterbury, and Primate of all England, when he sent out a certain Bishop of Jerusalem, for the purpose of taking the oversight of the English residents in Palestine and Syria, to circumscribe the authority committed to that Bishop within certain limits, which he himself, in the commendatory letters addressed to your Holinesses, clearly defines. 'Lest any,' such are his words, 'should be ignorant wherefore we have thus sent this our brother, we make known to you by these presents, that we have enjoined him by no means to interfere, in anything, with the authority that belongs to you, the Bishops, and the others who hold the office of rulers of the Eastern Churches, but, on the contrary, to yield you due honor and service, and to show a readiness always and in every way anxiously to promote what may conduce to brotherly love and friendly intercourse and concord. We are persuaded that this our dear brother will *ex animo* and conscientiously obey these our injunctions with faithfulness.'

"The Bishop who is at the present time entrusted with that authority, by name Samuel Gobat, entirely neglecting the commands of our late Metropolitan, and transgressing the injunctions which limit his authority, is harassing the Orthodox Eastern Church, as if it were corrupting the apostolic doctrines; and to such a pitch has he arrived, that he receives proselytes from the Eastern Church, and congregates them into a certain schismatical synagogue. Whence it has come to pass that the Anglican Church is brought into suspicion with your Holinesses, as if she were waging war against the ancient faith, and daring to bring in secretly other new dogmas.

"We, therefore, whose names are undersigned, Bishops, priests, and Deacons of the Anglo Catholic Church, make this declaration as follows:—We altogether protest against all such acts done or now being done by Samuel Gobat as proceeding from himself alone, and receiving no sanction from our Church; we would especially express our abhorrence of his proselytizing practices, as being repugnant to the compact (ratified A. D. 1841,) and as being direct infractions of the canons of the Church.

"We therefore pray your Holinesses not to impute these scandals to us and our Church. And we trust that this explanation may be received in a friendly spirit; and that your prayers may ever ascend for the well-being of the holy Churches of God and the union of all.

"We have set our hands to this in the month of August, A. D. 1853."

To this "Memorial" a "Committee of the Jerusalem Diocesan Fund," have replied. On that Committee are the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Lichfield and Manchester, and a number of Clergymen and Laymen. They say, "this Committee think it right to declare that the assertions of the paper alluded to have been made in great ignorance of the facts of the case, and are in themselves fallacious."

Besides this reply of the Committee, another important document has appeared, signed by the four Archbishops of Canterbury, York, Armagh, and Dublin. It is as follows:

"Whereas certain clergymen have addressed a memorial to the Oriental Patriarchs and Synods, in which the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem is accused of having exceeded the proper objects of his mission, and of introducing schism into the Eastern Churches;

"And whereas some of the names affixed to the said document are the names of persons who hold official station in the United Church of England and Ireland, and it might be supposed, at least in foreign parts, that a censure of the Bishop, as having acted without due authority from his Church, would not be made by persons who were themselves acting without such authority;

"Therefore we, the Metropolitans of the United Church of England and Ireland, deem it expedient to make this public declaration, that the said Memorial does not in any manner emanate from the said Church, or from persons authorized by that Church to pronounce decisions.

"We are induced to take this step, first, in order to guard against the danger which might arise to our own Church from the example of the irregular and unauthorized proceedings of the memorialists; and, further, because we sympathize with our brother, the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem, in his arduous position, and feel assured that his conduct, under the circumstances in which he is placed, will be guided by sound judgment and discretion.

J. B. CANTUAR,
T. EBOR,
JOHN G. ARMAGH,
RICHARD, DUBLIN."

"Nov. 1, 1853.

The end of this controversy in England is not yet. But the "Memorial" above given, has been sent to this country; and one of our Church newspapers republishes it, calls upon American Churchmen for signatures to the protest, and speaks of "the disgraceful history of the Jerusalem Bishopric," &c. We are not in possession of all the facts bearing upon this question, but as far as we are informed, we doubt very strongly, the propriety of such a protest on our part.

The alleged grounds on which Bishop Gobat's work is opposed are two fold; 1st, that he has violated an original agreement as to the manner in which that Mission was to be conducted; and, 2d, that he is promoting an unauthorized schism from the Oriental Churches. To the first charge, the Bishop and his friends plead not guilty; and for ourselves, we prefer to wait a further hearing, before pronouncing our opinion. As to the second, it is evident that every thing must depend upon the real character of those Churches themselves. *Practically*, the state of religion among the Oriental Christians, is so deplorable as to prove the greatest stumbling block among the Mohammedans. Recent testimony on this point before us, is overwhelming. *Theoretically*, they are considerably removed from the grosser corruptions of the Romish Communion. But the verities of the Christian Faith are, to a great extent, a dead letter; being veiled from the people by an almost universal ignorance, or concealed by a mass of popular superstitions and ceremonies. Every account on which we can rely, represents Christianity as in effect almost a nullity.

The Oriental Churches, which are to be reached, more or less directly, by the Jerusalem Mission, are the Greek, the Armenian, the Syrian, the Nestorian, and the Coptic Churches. Of these, the Greek Church numbers about 7,000,000 souls; the Armenian, about 5,000,000; the Nestorian and Syrian together only about 250,000. The whole number of these Oriental Christians may be safely estimated at from fifteen to sixteen millions. Unlike the Romish Church, they all reject the *Papal Supremacy*, and *Clerical celibacy*, and *Purgatory*, and *Communion in one kind*, and *Indulgences*, and *Masses for the Dead*. But then, they have the Worship of Pictures, (except the Nestorians,) and the Invocation of Saints. The Bible, and their Church Services, are in a language not understood by the people. The Greek Church holds essentially the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation. They all alike believe in the perfunctory nature of the Sacraments; and all alike, lose sight of the doctrine of Justification through grace by faith. Such is the field, into which Bishop Gobat, under the

special patronage of the Church Missionary Society has entered. Certainly if the Pope may parcel out England into Romish Dioceses, and send his Bishops, and Priests, and swarms of Jesuits to occupy them; if we as American Churchmen may send one Bishop to Texas, and another to California, without violating any principle of ecclesiastical order; if the Bishop of Rome may, for a long course of years, by every act of trickery and chicanery, seek to gain a supremacy over those Eastern Churches, and not always without success, then we say, it is at least an open question, whether the Anglican and American Churches may not have something to do in the East.

There is one other aspect of this question, which is of vast moment. Missionaries, non-Episcopal Missionaries from America, are exerting an influence in that quarter, the half of which has not been told. Here, at least, is a tangible fact. The celebrated traveler, Mr. Layard, in a late speech before Parliament, gave the following as the result of his own personal observation. He said :

"There was another cause (of alarm,) and one, perhaps, little imagined in this country, viz: *the spread of the Protestant faith among the Christians of the East*. It may be unknown to this House that mainly through the influence and teaching of the American Missionaries, scarcely a considerable town exists in Turkey in which there is not a nucleus of a Protestant community. The new converts were at first subjected to trials and persecutions; not, be it remembered, from the Turkish government, but from the heads of the churches to which they originally belonged. Lord Stratford and Lord Cowley at length obtained firmans of protection for the new sect, which was recognized by the Porte as one of the religious sects of the Empire, and received privileges accordingly. The spirit of *religious inquiry* has extended from the Armenians, among whom it first principally took root, to the Greeks, and in some instances whole villages have embraced the reformed faith. The Greek Clergy, backed by the Russian Mission, have done all in their power to check this movement; and when persecution was no longer available, *Prince Menschikoff* appeared at Constantinople.

"The great end of Russia has been to *crush the spirit of religious and political independence*, which has manifested itself of late among the Christian subjects of the Porte, and in this she has almost, if not entirely, succeeded."

This is putting a new face on the origin of the present war in the East. It attaches more importance to the labors of the American Missionaries, than the real state of the facts will warrant. We believe that the Emperor Nicholas, with other results which he hopes to gain, aims at arresting the rapid spread of Western influence generally. And yet among these influences, the efforts of these Missionaries cannot be lost sight of.

It is only about twenty years since these American Missions were established, and yet a late *non-Episcopal* writer says :

"The Church of Anitah, for example, has a congregation of five hundred, and numbers one hundred members. At Trebizond, on the Black Sea; Diarbekir, on the Tigris; Erzeroum, Sivas, Tokat, and many other places, flourishing churches of the reformed faith have been established by the American Missionaries, and there is a moral excitement throughout the Armenian population. The same is true, to some extent, of the Greeks."

Here then are facts, astounding facts. We, professing to be an Apostolic Church, with an Apostolic Ministry, and Faith, and Liturgy, are standing still, folding our hands in self-complacency, afraid to enter upon those fields white unto the harvest, lest we should be guilty of the sin of schism. While others are actually doing efficiently a work of revolution, the ultimate fruits of which it needs no prophet's eye to foretell.

In our July Number, we expressed the hope that our last General Convention would, in some form or other, resuscitate our Mission to the Oriental Churches. The Convention has passed by, and nothing has been done. Nothing is now likely to be done. If the English Church, through the "Jerusalem Mission," or by any other instrumentality, will act a conservative part, will reform without destroying; will cast aside the accretions of centuries of ignorance and superstition, without rooting up those old venerable institutions from their foundations—we, for one, will thank God for it. At any rate, we will not, like the dog in the manger, grumble and growl because others are disposed to do what we have no heart to do.

Thus much we have been disposed to say on the question, which is now, to some extent, agitating the English Church. That an uneasy, restless, even an enquiring spirit, has seized possession of great numbers in those Oriental Churches, is beyond dispute. That the charm of association, of a venerable antiquity, treasuring in its memories a noble past, has been broken, is equally certain. That the Gospel, as a living power, has little or no hold upon the masses of the people, is evident. That the Missionary Society, called the American Board, and composed wholly of non-Episcopalians, are pressing their efforts in that region with vast zeal, liberality, and efficiency, we have evidence to believe. That Rome stands ready as ever to spring her snare upon those feeble flocks, we positively know. That under all these circumstances, with a Turkish civil government, which guarantees entire freedom of conscience, those Churches will, if left alone, fall into the jaws either of Rome or of dissent, we regard as inevitable.

Now then, we say, that so far from *protesting* against the

action of the Church Missionary Society in England, in its endeavors to save for those old Churches their Primitive and Apostolic Ministry, and Creeds and Liturgies, we bid it God speed in its labors. That such is the praiseworthy design of the efforts of that Society, we believe, from the late letter of its Secretary, the Rev. Henry Venn, which we have before published. He says:

"In conclusion, though I have trespassed largely upon your Lordship's time, I must venture to present this subject in another, and, as it appears to me, most important point of view. It is a fact, which is too momentous to be passed over, that American Missionaries of non-Episcopal Churches have labored in the regions under review, with a very signal blessing from the Lord. They have multiplied their Stations in Asia Minor and Syria. They have numerous printing presses; and are dispensing the Word of God and Scriptural books in large numbers. Their schools are numerous: already, very considerable numbers of Armenian and Greek Christians have placed themselves under their instruction, and have formed themselves into Protestant communities. These and all other Protestant communities have been recognized in a recent firman from the Sultan, and have received ample protection, and have officers of government appointed to represent their interests. This Protestant movement is daily advancing throughout the East. Many appeals have been made to our Society, by Christian travelers and residents in those countries, to send zealous and able Missionaries of our Church. Many of the non-Episcopal Missionaries themselves, and some of their Directors in America, have expressed a desire to see the Church of England taking a more prominent part in the Scriptural revival of these Churches. Is this a time for hindrances and checks to be thrown in the way by faithful members of our own Church? If our Missionaries are held back, these alternatives are before us—one, that Protestant truth will be overcome and driven from the land, and these Churches will be shut up in their errors and darkness; the other, that the Bible will prevail in the hands of non-Episcopal Missionaries, and that, together with the removal of the errors and vices of the Oriental Churches, the Episcopal form of government will be lost in the newly formed Churches.

"The state of these lands is not unlike that of the European kingdoms at the beginning of the Reformation. Shall the Reformation take the turn, which it did in England and Sweden, or that which it took in Germany and Switzerland?

"I believe that the door is still open to the Church of England, and to her alone, to interpose for the preservation of that which we hold to be an Apostolic discipline—by persuading the rulers of the Oriental Churches to take part in the blessed reformation which has commenced.

"I would very humbly submit to your lordship, and the heads of our own Church, whether a new commendatory epistle might not be sent, either through Bishop Gobat or some other messenger of our Church, to the Oriental Ecclesiastical Authorities, to forewarn them of the danger before them, and to call upon them, for their own soul's welfare, as well as for the preservation of primitive discipline, to follow the example of the episcopal reformers of our Church, of blessed memory, and to place themselves at the head of the movements for the 'purification' of their Churches.

"I submit this proposal advisedly, having the means of knowing, from those best acquainted with the state of things, that the measure is feasible, and that the Missionaries of different denominations would not look with an unfriendly eye upon its execution.

"I have the honor to be, my Lord,

"Your Lordship's very faithful and obliged Servant,

"HENRY VENN.

"To the LORD BISHOP OF LONDON, &c. &c."

If such is the spirit with which that Society will prosecute its Missions in the East, we shall deeply regret to see the American Church committing so grave a blunder as to array herself against them; even though the Missions themselves are conducted under a system of policy, which we by no means approve.

Among a people, all whose habits and customs are eminent-ly ceremonial, who speak and almost think in the very lan-guage of symbols, it will not do to sunder every cord that binds such a people to the past. Their Creeds, and Liturgies, and traditions have connected them with the Church of Chry-sostom, and Cyril, and Athanasius; and it will be a sacri-legious hand that shall dissever them from such glorious old associations. For ourselves, we should prefer to see the exper-iment more fairly made, of trying to reform those Oriental Churches through their own spiritual and appointed guides. Hitherto such efforts have failed. If the people themselves are now to be addressed, let it be done by those who will not trample rudely under foot Institutions of apostolic and divine authority, rather than by those who will.

ART. IV.—LAUD'S CORRESPONDENCE.

Praestantium ac eruditorum Epistolae ecclesiasticae et theologiae, etc. Editio secunda, ab innumeris mendis repurgata, et altera parte auctior. Amstelodami, 1684. Folio, pp. xii, 988.

It is notorious, that during the period immediately following the Reformation, the connexion of Church of England divines with continental Protestants, was much closer than it has ever since been. And a very wrong conclusion has been drawn from this fact, *viz.*, that these divines have grown exclusive and unconciliatory, and have cast off their fellow Protestants, or kept them austere at a distance. The real truth is, that these Protestants have forsaken themselves, rather than been deserted and disowned by Anglicans. They have abandoned, either openly or virtually, their ancient standards, while the Church of England has kept hers “whole and undefiled.” This has unavoidably, and not unjustifiably, produced separation, if not alienation. But wherever Protestants have been found, who clung to such Protestantism as once awakened the sympathies of the Church of England for them, *then* our Episcopal divines have felt and exhibited a fraternal cordiality. Thus, Bishop Hobart, who once vindicated High-Churchmen by name, in a solemn official charge, nevertheless pleaded earnestly, and in the pulpit too, for the Waldenses, during his visit to Europe. He did this, moreover, within the very purlieus of the Vatican.* And who is there among us, but must be drawn with more than usual interest and yearning towards Protestants, who would make such a profession as did the divines of Poland, in the famous conference at Thorn, held in 1645. Say they, as if echoing the voices of times fully and fervently catholic—and that, also, after giving their hearty adhesion to the three great Creeds of antiquity—“we also acknowledge the confessions of the first Council of Ephesus, and of the Council of Chalcedon. Moreover, what the fifth and sixth Councils have opposed to the remains of the Nestorians and the Eutychians, with what the Council of Milevis, and the second Council of

* *Peyran's Waldenses*, Introd., p. lx.

Orange, taught out of the Scriptures, against the Pelagians. And, in fine, whatever the Primitive Church believed and taught from the times of the Apostles, with a notorious and unanimous consent, as a necessary article of faith, the same we also profess to believe and to teach out of the Scriptures.”*

Among all the divines of the Church of England, who have been supposed not hostile only, but malignant, towards Protestants not belonging to an Episcopal communion, no one has had a worse eminence than Archbishop Laud. His imagined virulence towards Calvinists and non-Episcopalians, has been written with an iron pen and a diamond's point, upon the everlasting rocks of adamantine prejudice. And yet, Laud, (like Andrews, and Field, and Hooker, who spake full kindly, if not benignly, of Nicene and Athanasian non-Episcopalians, calling their communions churches, &c.,) has manifested towards Protestants of the elder and purer type, not consideration barely, but downright amiability. This we propose to show ; or, rather, to let himself show, by documents which have never seen the light, save in a shape of which the present generation knows next to nothing.

Philip Limborth, the well known professor of Divinity at Amsterdam, during the latter part of the seventeenth century, published in the Latin language, two editions of a large volume of correspondence, whose title we have placed at the head of this article. In the second edition, he introduced quite a number of letters written by Archbishop Laud, which he was permitted to transcribe from copies, preserved by a civilian in Holland, of much fame and very high official rank.† And his prefatory observations, commanding such documents to his readers, amply prove, that he knew what an important service he was rendering to truth and history, by disclosing them to the world. Letters are often thrown away, or little cared for, by those who are ignorant respecting the original and ultimate authorities, upon which an intelligent historian most confidently builds. “ Letters,” says Limborth, “ have this peculiar advantage, as contributions to veritable history ; they exhibit, like a mirror, the genuine dispositions and morals of their authors. They are frequently written on sudden occasions, without premeditation ; and we see in them the writer's mind, at the time, without any mists hovering round to obscure his candor or sincerity.”

* *Augusti, Corpus Librorum Symbol.* Ed. 1827, p. 412.

† *George R. Doubletius.*

Now Laud's letters, as they will themselves make manifest, were composed under circumstances, which rendered them most accurate transcripts of himself. They are filled with deprecations for hurry, for tardiness, for crowding and overwhelming occupations; so that premeditation, if he desired it, was utterly out of the question. Here, then, we have Laud himself—his mind, his heart, his inmost soul, speaking to us: not the slow-paced dignitary, not the wily diplomatist, not the guarded statesman.

And, further, to whom did he speak? Not to a cabinet minister, or to an ecclesiastical inquisitor, but to a literary recluse, Gerard John Vossius, a professor of rhetoric, chronology, and history—one whose fellow-feeling with him was not that of an aspirant after power or exaltation, in the State or in the Church, but the refined, unworldly sympathy of a student. He was, too, an intimate personal friend; for Vossius visited Laud in England, and the Archbishop became a patron to his sons: whose want of patronage, by the way, proved beyond denial, that their father, like most hard students, was poor. To this dependent upon his bounty, this book-worm, retired from the world's bustle and solicitude to his philosophical cloister, Laud might evidently think aloud without apprehension; and the result will satisfy the discerning, that he did speak to him with unrestrained freedom.

On the whole, we believe there is nothing to be added, in this connexion, to inspire the fullest confidence in the honesty and singlemindedness of Laud's letters, which we have with considerable difficulty translated, and now present to our readers. We say *difficulty*, because all, who know anything of his style, are aware that it was one of the last things he stopped to care for; and that he was ever, what he called himself, “*rerum non verborum servus*”—an expression, which it will be seen we have translated, “A matter of fact man, and not a man of phrases.” In truth, his Latin is sometimes as Laudian as his English; and we can hardly wonder, that one of his learned friends should so poorly have satisfied him, (as one of the following letters evinces,) when he attempted to turn into classical Latin, the conference with Fisher the Jesuit. All we can say is, that by attempting to translate his ideas, rather than his expressions, we have endeavored to communicate the former, to the best of our ability. With these remarks, we shall now offer the correspondence in a vernacular garb. We merely add, to explain the signatures, that Laud was translated from the See of St. David's to that

of Bath and Wells, in 1626—made Bishop of London in 1628, and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633.

No. I.

WILLIAM, Bishop of Bath and Wells, wishes peace to GERARD JOHN VOSSIUS.
MOST LEARNED SIR:

You have afforded me a very agreeable opportunity, and one which I have long desired, to cultivate your acquaintance. I have received your letters, and wish you knew how much I prize them. With them came also your books, intended as a testimony of your affection toward myself, but at the same time a monument of your own erudition, more stable than brass. What I most value among them is your history of Pelagianism. This history has been filled with perplexities, not only by the lapse of time, but by the prejudices of controversialists; yet you have carried it, step by step, through all the sore spots of its annals, and, in spite of the terrible contentions of ecclesiastics, have arranged it with as much ingenuity as toil. I am now preparing letters for the Duke of Buckingham. From me, perhaps, he will first hear of our indebtedness to your pen. Let me ask one favor at your hands: do not expect too much from my hurried lines. I am not at home, and am always more of a matter of fact man, than a man of phrases. Nevertheless, I am meanwhile your servant in Christ, and, if the title is acceptable to you, your friend,

WILLIAM BATH AND WELLS.

HAMPTON COURT PALACE, Sept. 25, 1627.

Vossius was a scholar of prodigious learning, and used to boast that nothing once attained by him was ever forgotten. He has been accused of favoring the Arminians, in his celebrated history of Pelagianism; which Dr. Hey, the acute and candid Norrisian professor, recommended as the best book he knew upon the subject.* Be that as it may, Laud saw in him a fearless truth-teller, since he asserted, under no small peril, what no sound historic theologian will now deny, *viz.*, "that, before Augustine, the Latin fathers (the Greek ones always) used to ascribe perseverance to the *grace* of God, but not to any *decree* of God."† And even the Dutch, with all their High Calvinism, did not treat him as they did the half-politician and half-theologian, Grotius; since he lived and died among them, long after the Synod of Dort. If, therefore, Laud respected and esteemed Vossius for his imaginary Arminianism, the Dutch saw enough of Calvinism in him to let him live among them to the age of seventy-two—ay, and many a year afterwards, but for a misfortune, which has about it a species of the romantic. Vossius's study-ladder one day broke under him, his books fell from the shelves, and he was discovered a corpse, literally *libris obrutus*.

* Hey's Lect. 2d Ed. III, 198.

† Hey, III, 441.

No. II.

MOST DISTINGUISHED SIR:

I do not pretend by this letter, to give anything like an answer to the letters which your particular friend, Lord Carleton, delivered to me. Still, such is my esteem for you, that I cannot allow you to be neglected, or him to depart, without something in the shape of a communication. Some two months since, as I was attending the King on his journey to Hampton, I stepped from my chariot to leap over a brook, not over four feet broad, when landing upon soft sandy earth, I broke the posterior tendon of my right leg. From that moment I have been a cripple; nor does it yet appear, when I shall be likely to regain my pristine strength. Do you ask what this tends to? To the assurance that you have acquired but a crippled friend. Yet, with all that, though I cannot accomplish as much as both yourself and I desire, I will go strenuously to work, as soon as recovered vigor will permit, about the matters you have entrusted to my care. This, at least, I wish you to understand, that it is one part only of me which halts in your behalf—not my heart, not my feelings. My next letters, perchance, may bring you something more agreeable. Such is the fervent wish of your most loving friend,

WILLIAM BATH AND WELLS.

March 26, 1628.

No. III.

Your letters, always most grateful to me, arrived safely by the hands of Lord Stewart, who, together with the Rt. Hon. Lord Carleton, has very lately waited upon me. He delivered to me, together with your letters, your volume of *Theses*: a truly wonderful monument of your ability. You call it imperfect, and promise that, by and by, your portfolio will bring it forth in an enlarged and better shape. If so, I rejoice for the Church's sake, and for your own: the one will be thereby profited and the other honored. And I the more rejoice, because I hear that some of your admirers at Oxford have determined to print, and have actually begun to print, your *Theses*, in an imperfect state. I have done my best to prevent anything of yours seeing the light, in such a condition, and hope I have succeeded. I have written that you are about to publish them complete.

I applaud you for what you propose to do respecting Baronius; and, especially, because you have resolved not to criticise his minutiae. Assuredly, in a work so diffuse as his, it would take too much time to hunt after his smaller faults, and would weary the skillful and eager reader. What is of most consequence is, to show, with brevity, where Rome has departed furthest from the primitive Church, and to prove one's allegations demonstratively—each of which points, I have always flattered myself, you could easily accomplish. In due time, therefore, I shall expect your commentaries on Baronius in the Latin tongue; and doubt not I shall find you there, as on other occasions, the vindicator of our times against supercilious ignorance.

My misfortune was a serious one, and still clings to me, though I can crawl a little with the aid of a crutch. I no longer suffer pain in the injured part: only from weakness. This will be my daily guest till the year rolls round. If then it pleases to go away, my recovered agility will be like a return after absence to one's home: if not, I shall make it my aim to have an upright mind even in a halting body, and bow to circumstances.

I have done all I could for your business, under the hindrances which have overtaken me; and I will still labor for you, to the utmost of my love and strength. I beg to commend the health of my soul, as well as my body, to your prayers; yours are never forgotten by me. One thing truly grieves me, that, entangled as I am in business, I am almost an exile from my books; the only things, under God, which I idolize. I am anxious you should know this, lest hereafter you think me unworthy the name of *student*. May you long fare well, is the prayer of your most devoted friend,

WILLIAM LONDON.

July 14, 1628.

In this letter, we have irrefragable testimony respecting one of the most important, and one of the most characteristic things, which Laud ever attempted. No charge against him, in England or out of England, in his own times, none in later times, has been so rife and so intense, as the charge which has represented him as a secret but eager Romanizer. And yet here, and, as we shall see, again and again, and unweariedly, (as if it were a predominant aim of his life,) we find him striving to inflict on Rome, one of the hardest and one of the most disastrous blows, which she could possibly receive.

Cardinal Baronius* was Rome's favorite thesaurus for appeals to history, in the days when it was her fancy and fashion to appeal to history, rather than to development, for the maintenance of her cause. Baronius was her chief dependence against the embattled host, that had risen up in the shape of Magdeburg Centuriators, who, with wondrous toil and no inferior ability, had turned the testimony of century upon century (hence their name) against her strongest positions. Baronius, accordingly, was the Goliath ecclesiastic, whom, as Rome fain would have it, had given heresy to the fowls of the air and the beasts of the field. And yet, this gigantic champion of Popery was the identical one, whom Laud was conspiring to topple down; while, his right hand man, in such a formidable undertaking, was a Protestant of Calvinistic Holland! O, if Laud were a Papist, he must have been one so eminently disloyal, as to have contrived mischiefs, not to be matched, unless by the benefits accruing from the reckless fealty of Loyola and his Jesuits. And they who can believe in such a paradoxical possibility, are beyond the range of argument. They are wrapped up in prejudices tougher than the seven bulls' hides of ancient shields, and an arrow driven from a catapult could hardly reach their seat of sensibility. We may, therefore, legitimately despair of them.

This studied opposition to Romanism is, no doubt, the most important of the larger features of Laud's letters; but a smaller one is quite as prevalent, *viz.* his continual allusions to his need of a friend's intercessions, and his requests, always earnest and frequently touching, for a remembrance at the throne of grace. Had such a feature been found in the letters of a Puritan, it would have been considered an evidence of fervent personal piety. Must we believe, (let our readers never forget, that this importunity of Laud's was not meant,

* Came very near being a Pope. *Hoffmanni Lexicon*, I, 482.

like some old diaries we wot of, for the public eye,) *must* we believe, that, in him, this was the sniveling of hypocrisy, and “a token of perdition?”

Here we had intended that the comments on this letter should terminate; but there is something which has struck us as very impressive, in the *manner* in which Laud alludes to Baronius, beyond the *fact* of his allusion to him, and so we hope our readers will pardon a few words more.

This letter proves, not only that Laud knew *where* to assail Romanism, most effectively, but *how* also to conduct the onset, with most judgment and skill. It proves that he possessed, in a marked degree, a faculty, whose name, by a singular misnomer, tells a perfectly wrong tale about its prevalence—we mean what is usually styled “common sense.” This is a sense which learned men are apt to be devoid of. A very learned man, particularly, is too much inclined, in the management of controversies, to act like a lawyer, overflowing with material, who wastes more strength than is necessary on subordinate considerations. Such is said to have been the case with the great but redundant Hamilton, in his collisions with Aaron Burr. Whereas Burr, letting inferior objects slide, concentrated all his energies upon the fastening two or three leading ideas in the minds of a jury; and by art concealed under such apparent indifference, he is said to have achieved victories, in speeches of half an hour, which his antagonist failed to gain, by speeches of a quarter of a day.

We see the same sterling common sense in Laud, in the manner in which he would have the erudite Vossius, the living library, the man of adamantine memory, conduct a warfare with the Romish historical Coryphaeus. “Strike,” he bids him, “his salient points. Be brief. Show where Rome has deserted primitive antiquity, most glaringly. Make your conclusions demonstrative.” What peerless counsel! And had Vossius seized upon it, with the temper and the sagacity of its giver, his prodigious acquirements might have enabled him to be, to the Babylon of Italy, what Darius was to the Babylon of Chaldea, some twenty-one centuries before. “And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees’ excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah.” (*Isa. xiii, 19.*) The spirit of such a prophecy might have been verified by ecclesiastical royalties of later date, had the advice of William Laud been heeded, with aught of the solicitude and earnestness with which it was commended, reiterated, and pressed. And, yet, this actual William Laud was the secret friend and patron, nay, servile

deputy, of the supremacy he was toiling to undermine! O, tell it not in Gath, &c.

No. IV.

I send you your Theses printed at Oxford; but I wish my Oxonians had consulted your wishes and mine, and abstained from publication. How faithfully and diligently they have executed their work, you can judge from this specimen: this, at least, I will venture to say, they have done all they have attempted, with sincere affection towards yourself. Do you now fulfill what you have promised, and put out your own edition. And that you may know that I myself have gone over *some* of your pages, (for my leisure has not permitted me to be familiar with all of them,) I am particularly desirous you should read over, and correct impartially, those which you published when you were younger. Possibly you may discover some points in which, by your own judgment, you have departed from the most venerable and sound antiquity. An instance, in my hasty perusal, now occurs to me, in what you say of the baptism of John. The Fathers have never taught me, that that is the same with the baptism of Christ. Consider well the liberty taken by one altogether devoted to you; and if, for never so short a period, you postpone your edition, to make it riper, let it come forth emulous of the very purest antiquity.

Your design respecting Baptism, and, in general, a history of ancient rites, I cordially approve. Let me add a single caution: you again perceive how I take the liberty of a friend. Joseph Visconti [a Papist!] has written five books, concerning the ancient rites and ceremonies used in baptism. This circumstance, as it cannot escape you, will, I know, stimulate you to surpass him in arguments. I am extremely anxious, that nothing should appear under his name, which is not fully worthy my Vossius, and equal to his history of Pelagianism. I beg you will not forget what you have written concerning Baronius.

I return now to my sad afflictions. I am still mourning for the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham—a thing never to be done mourning for. And allow me to run over some of the wounds [*stigmata*] of this, to me, inauspicious year. At the beginning of it, as you know, I broke the tendon of my leg, and am yet a cripple. Then followed the Sermon before Parliament, imposed upon me by the King, in the midst of my infirmities—a labor full of difficulty and peril. Then, by a truly diabolical fate, fell my most dear friend, the Duke of Buckingham, and with him terminated an intercourse, that I had never had enough of.* After many and many a bitter sigh (for I grieved in secret, where I had no sympathy) I contracted an acute distemper, from which I am yet hardly convalescent. Shattered by four different attacks, a pleurisy at length struck me down. And I know not how many more misfortunes this unpropitious year may yet have in store for me. But the will of the God I serve be done; and may His special grace be ever with you and yours. So prays your most loving friend,

WILLIAM LONDON.

October 25, 1628.

Here we have one of the clearest proofs of Laud's intelligence, as a genuine Anglican Churchman. He is no hankerer after Scholasticism or Mediævalism. The most venerable, the most sound, the most pure Antiquity, (that which is again and again appealed to in the Prayer Book, and absolutely glorified in the Homilies,) this is the idol of his churchly affec-

* Not without its troubles, however. For Laud's most elaborate book, his Conference with Fisher, was undertaken to save his friend from becoming a Romish pervert! And that book saved the Duke, as it has many more.

tions. And if he did love an altar, and systematic arrangements, for the chaste and orderly performance of liturgical worship, it was because others were trying, as he said, to convert churches into barns, and make them, and all about them, as bald and slovenly as possible. Doubtless there are some fooleries in Ecclesiology, as wiseacres deal out its punctilio with senatorial gravity. But there is as great foolishness, in our view, in letting a liturgy be rattled over as if to be got rid of, or be submitted to with a jejune indifference, because some, forsooth, address themselves to its minutiae with the airs of a *petit maître*.

No. V.

That the diabolical crime and fate which overtook the most illustrious Duke, should have so lately reached you, was, at first, a matter of much wonder to me. But I soon remembered, how our harbors were closed in consequence of it, &c.*

What you say of the baptism of John, is amply sufficient for myself; and I only wish it was lawful for everybody, (or, as that is not to be hoped for,) somebody, to expound freely the opinions of the ancients, whether men will hear or will forbear. But, now, Christian philosophy seems to have fallen upon times, when it can neither speak out, nor keep silence, with safety. And at how much cost you would redeem the liberty you have taken in another case, for the real welfare of the Church, I can easily conjecture. Nevertheless, that it had cost you so much, I now learn for the first time by your latest letters. I would fain add more, but prudence forbids.

Concerning Joseph Visconti, I only made a suggestion, and that out of pure affection for you. It affords me the greatest joy to think, that you are pressing hard upon his footsteps, and will soon overtake him. You have answered all the points of my letter, *excepting what I said about Baronius*. Of him, you say not a word. Oh, let me implore you not to give this chiefest matter the go-by. Let nothing hinder your animadversions on him. You see what an importunate beggar I have become. Oh, do undertake this labor, that, at last, the Church may not want her own history, nor have to take up with that which is not her own. Only do this work concisely, and you shall be my blessed Christian Apollo. Farewell.

Thine,

WILLIAM LONDON.

May 10, 1629.

Here, his earnestness to procure the overthrow of Baronius amounts to a perfect passion, and he is ready to grant a quasi apotheosis to the man who will lay low such a vaunted authority. Where, among his Protestant accusers and persecutors, can we find such zealous and persistive ardor to do Rome detriment, not by clamorous abuse, but by well-aimed learning!

What characteristic language, and, when we think that two centuries have rolled by, leaving it still true, what melancholy

* The Dutch civilian, from whom Limborch copied these letters, leaves an occasional &c., in his lines; and he has no choice but to follow suit, being unable to supply the deficiency.

language, "that the Church may not want her own history, nor have to take up with that which is not her own!" It is an unpardonable opprobrium upon the Universities, and the theological literati of the Church of England, that they have left three grand things yet to be desired—a first-rate History of the Church, a full and thorough system of Dogmatic Divinity, and a critical and philosophical commentary upon the Scriptures. No less than *eleven* important theological works did good and patient old Joseph Bingham call for, in his last preface for his *Antiquities*.* But we might almost say of the lethargic scholars, to whom he, being dead, yet speaketh, what the prophet uttered of yore, "there was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped."†

No. VI.

The next letter begins with some account of what Laud had done, to promote the welfare of Vossius's son in England. He then returns to what lay so near his heart, the proposed critique upon Baronius, which Vossius informed him he had been obliged to lay aside, at the request of his superiors, to attend to the publication of a new edition of a work in the department of rhetoric. Laud alludes to this, in words descriptive of himself, and we there resume his language.

Although I am an orator destitute both of vehemence and sweetness—although I am so wrapped up in business as to have been compelled to send into oblivion, not only the art of oratory, but all other arts into the bargain; yet I certainly desire to see a work, which so many distinguished men have approved of, and which so great and so polished a genius as yours has determined to put forth afresh, after it has had the benefit of your maturest thoughts. Nevertheless, I think *my* claims [i. e. about Baronius] are not to be thrown into abeyance. You say the work you are issuing was your earliest essay. Well, why can you not attend to me, and your first love too! I certainly hope, that when this work has seen the light, you will be quite free for animadversions upon Baronius, and that you will devote as much labor to *them* as you possibly can.

As to the most illustrious Duke of Buckingham, whom popular fury snatched away, I have often laid my thoughts of him before you,‡ and I have to rejoice to find, by your latest letters, that you, too, esteem him so worthy of praise, as hardly to know his equal. And I the more commend your feelings towards our most munificent *Macenas*, because his name is a target, both at home and abroad. You have read, I presume, P. Berti's new work upon moles and bridges. What he was among *you*, (learned enough, no doubt,) you best know. What he now is, I am by no means ignorant of. When he changed his religion, he per-

* Bingham's *Antiq.*, Vol. ix, pp. 446-50.

† It is peculiarly vexatious to have to say this of a century, which produced historians like Hume and Gibbon, and which was famous in politics and literature, for such names as Pitt, Burke, Addison and Johnson. And, yet, in that *dark age* of the Church of England, even Bingham was forgotten, though translated into Latin on the Continent!—*Dowling's Introd. to Church History*, pp. 163.

‡ In conversation probably.

haps filled up the apostasy of the saints. In the fourth chapter of his work, he utters a violent invective against the Duke. In his eighteenth, he calls him the provoker and ringleader of all our mischiefs. What possesses the man! And what harm did Buckingham ever do him? But, perchance, he is the tool of the French, among whom he now resides. Meanwhile, as he rages against the dead, he commits a double error upon the same page. He has it, that the Duke was stabbed by a noble Scot; whereas, he received his death from an ignoble Englishman. Then he tells us that Essex was his substitute; when, not he, but Linsey supplied his place. God grant this learned man a better mind.

In the last place, you write that you have heard from those who appear not unacquainted with British affairs, that at this time there is a dissension among our doctors, about predestination and its kindred dogmas, and that the improvident zeal of some has almost produced a schism. Also, of other matters, which kept me and other persons busy enough, during the last Parliament. I certainly passed over all these things in my foregoing letters, *from design*. Partly, because there was a universal soreness, let me touch where I might; and I would not fret that which I could not heal. Partly because nothing ever pleased me less, than the defiling one's own nest. Moreover, I had made up my mind to say nothing but what was good concerning Parliament; and its doings would not always endure truth-telling. But the chief cause of my silence was this. I was afraid that you would think me, who am harassed and spied after on all sides, indulging an impotent wrath, or croaking about my country or my church:—this last, certainly, a most unbecoming exhibition of feeling, and one which, as Cicero of old said, had much better be expended on a foreign than on one's native land. But since you will have them, take these drops which ooze from an often lacerated heart.

I have left no stone unturned, to prevent the public discussion of these perplexing and staggering questions. And for this reason. I thought that charity and piety would be violated, under a pretence of truth-seeking. I have ever urged moderate counsels respecting them, lest men full of zeal, but upon whose shoulders the chief responsibilities concerning religion did not rest, should throw off everything into confusion. Not, perhaps, because this was the best way to please people; but I remembered how, to the last, the Saviour commended charity to his followers; and too, with what caution and patience the Apostle would treat the weak. And if in these acts I perish, (made a prey of, as is usual, among contestants for victory,) I have my labor for my pains; nor, out of myself, except in God, have I an atom of comfort. In the meantime, while my hopes are few my fears are manifold. The Reformed Church [and here, as will be seen, he takes in continental Protestants] does not regard that, which she should more grieve and care for than the sword, now unsheathed among so many nations other than our own, *viz.*, lest among ourselves and you, where she has found her safest refuge, being torn by her own hands, first into large factions, and finally into smaller, she may at length wane and vanish into nothing. And there is something besides, which I seem to myself to foresee. But it is better to pray against it, than to foretell it; and, under present circumstances, I have not the slightest desire to be a prophet. More I am unwilling to say, lest, while I dwell upon these deplorable times, I let fall what I am particularly desirous nobody should know. Concerning *myself*, however, I am anxious you should know one thing. God being my helper, I will do my best, that truth and peace shall kiss each other. If it shall please God that my prayers go unanswered, then my hope will be to reach, as soon as possible, my eternal rest—leaving those who sunder truth and peace to be converted, (which is my heart's desire for them,) or else, chastised in God's own time.

By the command of the King's Majesty, the sermons of the late Bishop of Winchester, [Andrews,] a most learned and holy prelate, have been edited by myself and the Bishop of Ely; but as they are in my vernacular tongue, I do not transmit them to you. Another volume, much smaller every way than that,

I do send, together with this letter, as it is composed in a tongue common to both of us. It contains some things I am anxious you should see.*

Thus you have my long-spun and unpolished letter—but I have no time to weary you more. Farewell to your dignity, and in all your prayers remember, as my necessities require,

Your most loving friend,

WILLIAM LONDON.

July 14, 1629.

This is one of the most remarkable, on some accounts, the most memorable, of this series of letters. Here, first, we obtain Laud's views of a class of persons, who are now dismally famous in our own Church, the perverts to Rome; and secondly, his estimate of the public affairs of his own agitated and then shaking kingdom.

Berti, (or Bertius,) whom he here quotes and criticises, was a pervert to Popery; and, ostensibly, a martyr for the sake of Arminianism. The Dutch had no mercy on him, though he was burdened with a numerous family. He took refuge in France, and was made a professor of rhetoric in Boncourt College, and royal historiographer. If any possible pervert could have been regarded by Laud, with something more than commiseration, it must have been such an one as Berti. Yet, with him, he is nothing, (aye, with all his acknowledged learning and sufferings,) but an apostate from the communion of Saints—the hindermost, too, of that doleful procession he hopes ever to see.

But the more striking portion of his letter is that which relates to English affairs. Those who take up these letters, as perfect novelties, will unquestionably expect to find them replete with Jeremiads about Puritanism, and acrimonious tirades against its schismatical and heretical tendencies. It now appears, that even to a private correspondent, and he an intimate and devoted friend, Laud maintained a blank silence concerning topics, which many would suppose him running over with, and clamorous about, from morn to noon, from noon to dewy eve. But even to such a man, he closes his lips, till importunity wrings from him most reluctant confessions. With genuine magnanimity, he abhors taletelling about his Church's infirmities or perils—a warning model to those whiners, who seem to take unwearied delight in faulting the Church for what she is, and sighing for what she ought to be: meanwhile allowing themselves to grow fallow and full of weeds. With wholesouled patriotism, he will not bruit even the political misdoings of the internal enemies of his

* This volume, his Conference with Fisher, did not go after all. The explanation will be found in letter sixteenth of this series.

country, and quotes a heathen against those half-traitors, who are perpetually putting legislatures, cabinets, and chief magistrates, to open shame. Nay, he will not let a word go, but as if it were wrenched away from him, and stained, by his efforts at resistance, with his blood.

But when he does speak, how wisely and benignly he hints of questions in theology, which he knew, and we all know, have never been satisfactorily determined, and never will be, till "fixed fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute," are seen wrought into a harmony, we may possibly comprehend when equal unto the angels, but not while we continue worms of the dust. These questions, as a timeserver, he would not dare to forbid to the adventurous; but for Christian charity's sake, and the sake of the "unlearned and ignorant," he frowns upon their discussion. And then comes the most wondrous exhibition of all. He makes common cause with continental Protestants, of the Dutch and similar schools, and wants them consolidated against the grand foe, who would trample Protestantism of all sorts, and stamp it with a heel of iron into dusty death. No greater mistake could Protestantism commit, in his view, than to be factious *within itself*, and thus insanely minister to its own destruction: allow itself to be shred away piecemeal, and so vanquished in detail, when it might be invincible as a compacted whole. And, thus, comes out the grand secret of his opposition, and if you will, hostility, to Puritanism. Puritanism, according to his construction, was doing the unholiest and most unblessed of all works possible for the Reformed Religion at large; because it was weakening the Church of England *within itself*, and thus making ready the way for the return, and restoration, and triumph, and dominion of Popery upon English soil. Hence, if he even hated Puritanism, it was because he hated Rome more! He looked rather to its ultimate effects, than to its ostensible bearings. It was beyond question with him, (wrong or right, it matters not—such was his honest judgment,) just what King James had previously called it, "a new tout upon an auld horn," a Romish enemy in disguise; and he lifted up his warning against it, just as he did against Baronius, for the salvation of his Church, of his country, and of the Protestant Reformed Religion throughout Europe.

We may assert, that Laud was mistaken, was profoundly mistaken. But he was not looking for immediate issues. His eye was ever stretching towards the future, and not hoodwinked, like that of a shortsighted partisan. This very letter speaks of "something else," which he seemed to foresee, far

worse than any temporary disaster. Most likely, this mysteriously solemn hint regarded the downfall of the King and the Constitution of England, and the triumph in the distance, not of those who had taken off the King's head, but of those who had instigated that tragedy, the invisible emissaries of the Popedom!

And had he been gifted with prophetic vision, penetrating to still remoter times, even to our own, what would he not have apprehended, not from England's immediate, but from her ultimate foes! For what have the factionaries of Protestantism accomplished, towards staying, staying merely, not rolling back, Popery's spreading and deepening floods? Is Popery as weak now, as it was in the olden time, when Protestantism thought not of quarreling with itself, but with her only? Have the Cathari of modern days, those who lift their head highest among Reformers, as the Pure even in such a company—have they kept their self-chosen foundations from rotting beneath their feet? and that, too, in their ecclesiastical El Dorado, in New England, "the sabbath and port" of their pilgrimage? Dr. Dana and Dr. Hall, with an horizon of echoes, could give us an answer, like the groans of a mountain in labor.

Alas, then, for Protestantism, if two hundred years have not taught it the virtue, with which Laud would have inspired it, the virtue of self-preservation for grand conquests, rather than selfishness for ephemeral gains! But so it is. Protestantism is consuming its own vitality. The wretched fact cannot be blinked by sophistry, or waived off with an incredulous smile. Its sects are as hostile to each other, as they are to Popery itself; grimly as they may survey the thronging and encircling enemy. And more, and worse. These sects are just as hostile to the very *propugnaculum* of their cause as Protestants, (the Church of England and its sisters,) as if the success of that Church would be to them a disaster, a calamity. It might easily be otherwise; for, singularly enough, this Church is always the *next best* with every one of them. The Baptist, then, might keep his scruples about infant baptism in abeyance, for the sake of making common cause against the Roman invader. The Presbyterian, for the same foremost of necessities, might easily endure a oneheaded Episcopacy, having already a many-headed one. The Congregationalist, having abandoned his own old platforms, and having nothing to get rid of but old prejudices, might do so without a single doctrinal qualm. The Methodist—why he has no excuse whatever: we only

lack, in his view, the zeal with which he might inoculate our formality. Each and all of these might come, and cast in their lot with us, and we could all stand together, upon the platform of the great Council of Nice, *on which all Christians once stood, making one Communion of Saints.* And if they would, then the East and the West might reunite, like the mingling floods of the Red Sea, and Rome, like persecuting Pharaoh, be absolutely drowned out and cast ashore.

But no, this glorious consummation may not be. We must rather do that, which Laud pronounced more terrible than the sword of remorseless war. We must pick each other's eyes out. We must mangle and whittle each other away into shreds and patches, till Rome stalks at last unrebuked over our *dead* level, made ready beforehand, to smooth her rugged path. Ah! Protestants do not know what they are doing; and the day may too soon arrive, when Laud's melancholy warnings, like the rejected prophecies of Cassandra, will fill them with unavailing astonishment.

No. VII.

Your letters, most distinguished Sir, three in number, have filled both my hands full, since I addressed you in person or by my pen. [Vossius had visited England.] As successors to these letters, have come pleasant messages, informing me of your safe return to your native land. I rejoice greatly, that to any one the continuance of your life and health for the good of the Church, is a subject of earnest prayer. With what different dispositions from some people, such persons have looked upon those who have friends among the devotees of royalty and an ancient church, I can well conceive. If you have extorted a scruple of deference from the more prudent, it is very well indeed: those who dread an official spy for such conduct, I turn over to the populace. Let any one care for such who chooses. The messages in question did not name me in person, but I well understand my predicament, and the madness which rages round me.

And now, again, let me inculcate the lesson which I have given you about Baronius. You very well know what my wishes are, and of what advantage to the Church a proper censure of this work would be.

Your truce with Spain, I pray may not longer continue; or that it may turn out profitably to your country, and to the Church. In my judgment, they will take no imprudent precaution, who act as if in dread of foreign broils, in consequence of the state of religion among you. Concerning your Scioppius, and other blots upon our reformed religion, I know not what to say. I rejoice that even at Amsterdam, (which has been an asylum for all sorts of liberty,) those have been found, who are severe upon such a calumniator.

With strong affection, certainly, and (if with prudence and auspicious omens) to good purpose, the Oxonians have pursued me with another title, and made me, both unworthy and unwilling, their chancellor.

As to other matters, I wish you to know, that although I may not succeed in allaying the tempests which in this age are shaking the Church, that yet, God helping me, I will never desert such an object, or my duty to it. Still, it must be obvious to any body, how governments are tossed about by ecclesiastical fluctuations.

I earnestly beseech you, and in the name of our Redeemer, never to cease offering for me daily supplications, that I be not left alone amid the machinations

of my enemies. Meanwhile, my desire is, that you may live and be happy ; and that I may continue to be, as I am, the admirer of your virtues, and your most loving friend,

WILLIAM LONDON.

July 21, 1630.

This letter follows up the persistive allusions to Baronius, as usual, and contains a marked reference to another Romish pervert. Scioppius, like Berti, was a man of no small ability and attainments, and was esteemed a singular acquisition to Trentine interests ; for he assailed Protestantism with a virulence, surpassing, if it were possible, that of John Henry Newman. But with Laud, it will be seen, he was a gangrenous blot upon the escutcheon of the Reformed Religion. Though Scioppius was, of course, no loss and no dishonor to the Anglican cause, the Anglican bishop seems to have felt, full keenly, the desertion of Protestantism by one who wielded so sharp a pen ; and rejoices, not a little, that even Protestants of latitudinarian liberality, are spirited enough to scourge him. Scioppius found a patron in Clement VIII, who gloated over his spiteful pages, and created him a knight of St. Peter ; while Laud denounced him as a calumniating renegado. This was copying a Romish precedent with a vengeance !

No. VIII.

MOST ESTEEMED SIR :

Just while I was writing letters for myself, (a thing which business and fatigue prevent my doing but rarely,) your letters reached me. So our buckets were drawing from the same well, while neither knew the occupation of the other.

Your first letter congratulates me upon my Oxford chancellorship, and smiles over it. You may rejoice, if you have a mind to, in thinking that my election will be for the welfare of the University : for myself, I well know what a load this new appointment will impose upon me—one, too, for which I am quite incompetent. But in these terribly sore times of the Church, it is not for the Church alone, that I know not, (may God love me, as I speak the truth,) I know not what is to be done. I know as little what I ought to do, for my individual interests ; and thus, perhaps, God is pleased to chastise me. But there is something else commanding my attention, and I accordingly turn to it. Our most illustrious prince, considering his tender age, is quite well.*

Other subjects my hurry compels me to pass by. But the death of Matthew Martin is certainly a subject for deep grief, since the Church is in vast want of moderation like his, and which, I trust, has not been entirely buried in his grave. "Entirely," I say ; yet I much fear lest this virtue become much rarer than befits our profession. That history, from which he professes to have derived it, he was a master of, and perhaps his mantle may fall on others, unless his readers prove unworthy of him. So again do I give you thanks, for having had such a man among you. And, now, gird yourself up for that other history, which you

* Charles the Second, born May, 1629, and, as the year then began March 25, not two years old. Charles's elder brother died in infancy, hence the solicitude for himself.

have more than once promised to write—the history of the Primitive Church. Most earnestly do I desire, if God pleases, before destiny opens my sepulchre, to see Baronius falling under your weapons ; and you must never expect a letter from me, without a goad in it, until you accomplish your task.

Your most devoted friend,

WILLIAM LONDON.

12 *Kal.* : Feb. 1630, i. e. now 1631.

The last letter almost breathed out an anathema against a Romish pervert. This pronounces a panegyric upon a most estimable continental Protestant ; chiefly, too, because he was a theologian not armed at all points, like a chestnut-burr, but a man of exemplary amenity and moderation. Matthew Martin (or Martinius) was president of the college at Bremen, and raised that college to a high reputation in Germany. He died in 1630, and the lamentation of Laud fell when the turf was probably fresh upon his grave. Yet he mourns, it will be perceived, not so much for the loss of his learning, though that might not easily be supplied ;* as for the loss of his pacific disposition, which, in those turbulent times, it was far more difficult to perpetuate.

It may look strangely to some, that Laud should have been an admirer of a virtue, which, as his opponents averred, he himself never exemplified. We forget his tantalizing, abrading provocations. He was himself eminently straight-forward and open ; and nothing pestered him and threw him off his guard so quickly as double-mindedness, quirks, and trickery. For example : Shepard, once a clergyman of the English Church, and afterwards the Puritan minister of Cambridge, New England, has represented Laud as “swollen with secret venom.” But an accurate observer of the interview, from which Shepard drew such an ungenerous conclusion, will find quite another explanation for the warm effusion of blood which mantled the prelate’s countenance. He complained, bitterly, of the prevarications of the Puritan ministers summoned before him, and declared, with warmth, that they equivocated with him just as badly as did the Jesuits. Here, then, was the secret of his flushed and glowing face. He was angry (who might not be, and most righteously ?) because the truth was paltered with, and not told him in downright plainness. And we sadly fear that Jesuitical evasions, maneuvering, and truth-shying, are not to be charged engrossingly to but one class of individuals, “ who profess and call themselves Christians.” We sadly fear (not to come

* Graecè Latinèque doctissimus—immortale nomen adeptus.—*Hoffmanni Lexicon*, III, 98.

nearer home) that many and many a good sectarian, who has abhorred falseswearing, intemperance, and licentiousness, with all his might, has not been half as chary as duty bade, about quibbling, and equivocating, and solemn offenses against candor. It is a singular, almost mysterious, propensity of human nature, to

Compound for sins it is inclined to,
By damning those it has no mind to.

If Laud had an irritable temper (as these very letters shrink not from the admission of) he was never implacable, never inaccessible to all honest, fair-dealing remonstrance. The manner in which he permitted young Mr. Hyde, afterwards Lord Clarendon, to address him upon the very subject of his irascibility, and to dwell upon its mischievous consequences, is a memorable proof, that he had one of the virtues of the great captain of Syria; who, no doubt, was prone to fly into a passion, but whom his menials did not hesitate to approach, in almost the acme of his fury, with the plaindealing of frank friendship. Naaman yielded, and so did Laud; for he liked young Hyde ever after, and listened to him with habitual complaisance. This is admitted by a biographer of Clarendon, who is anything but a friend to the archbishop. (*Lister's Clarendon*, I, 28.)

No. IX.

To-day I owe you two letters, for I have received as many, and have not returned you one. Truly, I am slow in paying such kinds of debts—debts too great indeed for me ever to pay. I am so overwhelmed with business, that oftentimes I cannot pay what is due to myself; how, then, can it be expected, I should deal better by my friends?

And, now, that I may not be wanting in the duty of correspondence, I will try to thank you, as one may, who knows at least this one thing—how to say much in a few words. I understand from both your letters [Here, unfortunately Limbörch's copy left an hiatus. Probably Vossius had been giving fresh excuses for putting off his proposed onslaught upon Baronius.]

If you have your materials ready, I am quite unwilling to have you run away from the task. Remember what was said about hiding one's light under a bushel. And, too, that your labors will not be lost, if you bring up from the dust, not ancient writings only, but those almost ancient, and illuminate them with your mind's bright light. I shall forever be pressing Baronius upon you, and the more, as you acknowledge the Church [of course *not* the Church of England] is urging upon you the same thing.

I congratulate your prince upon his victory. May it turn out for the glory of God and the good of the Church. Of his prudence, and the courage of his soldiers, I have no doubt. But if again, and upon a sea not red, a cloud has gone before Israel, then forget not to give to Cæsar the things that be Cæsar's, &c.

Consider me always your most faithful friend,

WILLIAM LONDON.

November 7, 1631.

No. X.

That I do not write you more and oftener, is to be charged to business, not to my inclinations. And, now, I still am harping upon Baronius, the matter which I have so much at heart. Remember this well, that I both have done, and will do, for our most worthy friend Grotius, all which can be done for his honor and interest. The issue must be with God. Farewell, and as often as you worship the Almighty pray for me.

In Christ, your most devoted friend,

WILLIAM LONDON.

London, Dec. 26, 1632.

No. XI.

MOST HONORED SIR:

Your letters, always pleasing to me, are now particularly so. I have long wished for such a brief, but lucid, exposition of the opinions of Godeschalchus, as I have not yet been able to find. And I certainly think he started a controversy respecting grace and free will, most inauspiciously, because scarce any persons who have receded from the fathers, who went before St. Augustine, have handled this subject so well, as those who went before Godeschalchus himself.* [No mean proof this, of Laud's scholarship as an historic theologian.] Your letters, with the documents included, have abundantly answered my wishes, and I give you my thanks. If, however, after a still further and fuller investigation, you are again disposed to write to me, whatever you have to say will be very highly acceptable.

Your Grammatical Exercises, which circumstances obliged you to publish, will doubtless be very useful to others. They will be more acceptable to me, if they do not withdraw you from Baronius. I do most mightily desire to see the history of the Primitive Church, either arranged by you, or purified of all superfluities; that is, set free from the prejudices and interpolations of contending factions. May God long preserve you for yourself, and yours, and me. So prays the admirer of your name and merits,

WILLIAM LONDON.

Feb. 15, 1632, English Style.†

No. XII.

MOST EXCELLENT SIR:

How much I have been distracted by business, let this show. Your letters, ever grateful to me, dated the day after the Kalends of October, and received by me the 28th of the same month, I have as yet scarce found a moment's leisure to answer. Public duties called me away; private but extremely necessary duties called me back. I have had to begin and finish, in the same year, two long troublesome and expensive journeys; one into Scotland, and another to the See of Canterbury. That I have returned safe from one, and have been carried forward in the other, by (I hope) good auspices, will I know be pleasant to you to hear. Not thus will all be effected, who hear as much, whether among you or ourselves; for the virulence of multitudes never lets me alone. I thank God, that there is no known cause for their assaults upon my reputation with poisoned fangs, unless it be, that for many years it has been a practice in the Church of God, for those to be in poorest esteem with the sons of the Church, (as they

* Godeschalchus was an extreme predestinarian; a believer in reprobation. He died A. D. 869. His name is sometimes written Gottschalk. *Murdock's Mosheim*, II, 87. Mosheim was mistaken, however, in saying his opinions were those of Augustine. Augustine rejected reprobation. Emerson's *Wiggers*, pp. 239, 247, 251. Compare Neander's *Ch. Hist.* IV, 384, Eng. Ed.

† Vossius dates his letters by the Gregorian Style, which was not introduced into England till 1752.

would fain be estimated,) who have at heart the best interests of the Church, and long for her peace. Yet such must be passed over, or nothing can be accomplished for the Church's good. I pray God to give me constancy and patience; for each of these virtues has become an achievement of the greatest difficulty, to one situated as I am. And do you, meanwhile, commend me in your petitions to the great and ever blessed Jehovah. Thus fortified, I may follow the leadings of Providence; and may God grant to the malevolent, pardon and a better mind.

As to your son John [*hiatus*.] The books which you sent, together with the letters, came uninjured to my hands. I congratulated you upon having such a son as Dyonisius; who, though a youth, has shown so much genius, that he will become *facile princeps* among the learned, if he only goes forward at the pace with which he has hitherto traveled. Concerning yourself, I know not what to say, unless it be, to tell you how much I mourn to find you so disturbed, as to let work go to sleep which you are anxious to finish. Remember, that in the same proportion in which you fail for yourself, you are less serviceable to me. Nevertheless, I will hope, though against hope, that all impediments will finally be surmounted, and that Vossius upon Baronius will not always be at a standstill.

I have very lately seen your letters to Goffe [*hiatus*.] It is the merest fiction, to suppose that an English bishop can exercise jurisdiction among your churches. He can never do this, but in his dreams. Davenport manufactured that, as a poet, if he said so. For the truth is, it was the King's *wish*, that merchants, and others owing him allegiance, might not appoint Forbes, or any like him, over the English Church, [*i. e.* in Amsterdam.] So Forbes was sent off, and Goffe, your correspondent, and a *prudent* asserter of our discipline, was substituted by the suffrage of all. And pray what has this to do with jurisdiction over your churches? But since the whole thing smells of Davenport, you shall know something about that gentleman's performances among ourselves. More than three years ago, he presented himself before me, then bishop of London, [*hiatus*.] If there is anything in such an apostate from his own Church, and the Reformed Church, acceptable to the people of Amsterdam, may he enjoy his good fortune, and may they have enough of him.

I will no longer detain you from your studies, more important than any epistles of mine. Farewell, and whenever you address God in your own behalf, remember before our common Redeemer, a most loving friend of you and yours,

WILLIAM CANTERBURY.

Lambeth, Feb. 24, 1633, i. e. now 1634.

P. S.—After I had written the above and not before, intelligence reached me of the death of your son—whether John or Dyonisius, does not appear, but I fear the latter. God grant, whichever of them it be, that you be not afflicted beyond your strength.

Our comments had grown, as some of our readers may have fancied, quite too spacious, and we have accordingly permitted several of the letters to pass unnoticed. We are constrained, however, to stop here; for a development of marvelous interest commands our attention. Laud now exhibits himself, as what might be called a strict constructionist of Episcopal jurisdictions, and, again, as a rasper of Romish perverts. The Davenport, here alluded to, was a younger brother of John Davenport, so celebrated in the early history of the colony of New Haven. After his defection to Popery, he wrote a book very much in the strain of Tract No. xc, so famous and infamous

among the productions of modern Oxford. Like that, it commented on the Thirty-nine Articles, endeavoring to make out their compatibility with the dogmas of Rome. From this work, Mr. Newman, not improbably, gleaned his pernicious theory in the tract just alluded to, and, perhaps, many of his sophistical arguments. Davenport also composed a treatise upon Episcopacy, and presented himself before Laud, for the purpose of obtaining his permission to print it—the Bishop of London being then a censor of the press. Laud saw through his Jesuitical cunning, (his object was to identify Laud, or the Church of England with a Romish production,) as effectually, as when the same cunning opened on him from an apparently opposite quarter. He told Mr. Davenport, very drily, and very flatly, that the Episcopacy of Protestant England wanted no such equivocal auxiliaries as he was ; that it was abundantly able to make its own cause good, without Romish coöperation ; and literally, sent him packing. We perceive from this letter, how little fragrance he had left behind him, in our libeled prelate's memory.

Davenport took revenge worthy a Jesuit. He found English influence at work, to secure the election of a certain individual to the rectorship of the English Church at Amsterdam. This he artfully represented, as an insidious attempt on the part of England, to throw the chains of Episcopacy across the British Channel, under the plausible guise of English protection. Vossius, fortunately, alighted upon the trail of the snake ; and, knowing that candor was then the order of the day at Canterbury, asked some plain questions, and received as plain answers—answers, the sapidity of which, we are afraid, some of our high and dry friends will not pronounce stomachic. He is told, without disguise, that the King preferred Goffe to Forbes, (who, by the way, was really an exile from Scotland for his Churchmanship, and almost an Episcopal martyr,) and because Goffe, forsooth, was a *prudent* asserter of Episcopal discipline. Forbes, it is more than possible, might proclaim Episcopacy, and, it may be, baptismal regeneration, (for he calls Baptism, in his elaborate *Historic Theology, divinum salutis medium,*) in terms a little too stirring for Presbyterian nerves, albeit they were somewhat hebetated by a coating of Dutch phlegm. So Goffe, who was prudent about administering a rash bolus, in such queasy proximities, was cautiously substituted in his place. And this, by a King Charles I, with a Laud at his elbow !

We are *now* afraid some of our *not* high and dry friends will begin to suspect, that we are drawing upon our imagina-

tion for this exquisite piece of mosaic. But there the facts are, in all their stubbornness ; as unplastic as if they were fossil petrifactions. We are not alchemists enough to distill them through a party alembic. They who choose to cut the knot of perplexity, by saying they do not believe them, can do so upon their free responsibility. We shall not disturb their private judgment, go it to the right hand or to the left.

No. XIII.

You must take this epistle, my deservedly most dear friend, all by itself, and brief enough too. In it you have an answer to your three most acceptable ones ; yet such an answer, as a mass of almost overwhelming business permits, *i. e.* rough and unpolished, pleasant only for its brevity, spotless only for its love ; in every other respect a mere scrawl.

And now to your first letter, [hiatus.] To your second letter, [hiatus.]

From your latest letters, I learn that your grammatical labors have almost reached a close. I certainly rejoice, and all the more, because I am forever thinking of Baronius. The book you sent, with your letters, [hiatus.] By the command of the King, I now make you this reply. He is willing, whenever it is agreeable to you, that the Dedication of this book be addressed to the Most Illustrious Charles, Prince of Wales. Go on now, and let us have this book on Public Law, &c.

Your most loving friend,

WILLIAM CANTERBURY.

Lambeth, Feb. 27, 1634, English style.

No. XIV.

MOST DISTINGUISHED SIR :

Your letters, as ever, were most grateful to me. I received them, almost a year ago ; but as I may freely say, and as truth demands, matters of pressing business, at almost every instant of time, have called me away, when I would fain have replied to you. In these letters you congratulate the kingdom, and myself, that I have revived that right of visiting Universities, which Archbishops of Canterbury have possessed from ancient times. It is indeed an arduous work, to revive what has for a long time been in abeyance, and to exercise what is always unwelcome. But by the mercy of God, and the justice of our Most Excellent King, the power of visiting Universities, due to me and —, for many years back, has at length been decreed to us. And I will now take care, and I hope no useless care, that Universities may flourish, and their members go forth, more cultivated in manners, more polished in learning, and more conformed to the religion of ancient times ; and that, from the very commencement of their studies, they may imbibe principles, which will promote the worship of God, the peace of the Church, and the honor of seminaries of learning. Nothing can be truer, than what you say, that all human institutions, even the best, are, through carelessness, tending to the worse. What then must be the issue, when the malice of some, who want nothing but extravagancies, is superadded to the carelessness of others !

Goffe was here long since, [hiatus] the herald of your virtues, not undeservedly, [hiatus.] Pardon, I pray you my delay, and when next you write, I hope I shall be *able*, (though you must ever think me *willing*), to give you much speedier answers. Farewell, and as you daily worship God, forget not, I beseech you, to remember in your prayers.

Your most faithful friend,

WILLIAM CANTERBURY.

Lambeth, June, 1637.

No. XV.

William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Pastors and Professors of Switzerland, greeting:

My dearest fellow brethren, the most learned Pastors and Professors of the Churches and Schools of Zurich, Berne, Basle, and Schafhausen.

Your letters, dated at Zurich, March 21, 1639, I received on the 11th of April, with a duplicate of them, on the 18th of our style. And, assuredly, they were acceptable to me, for two reasons: first, because they were yours, and next, because their object was to promote Christian peace. Such letters well become those, who are members of the same body, and who together profess, and believe in, the Communion of Saints.

Of a truth, I am not unaware of the calamities, which have befallen your Germany, and especially the Palatinate. Nor am I ever forgetful of those miseries, which everywhere follow in the train of civil war; and which, if suffered to increase, may soon redder the soil of Britain with the blood of her own children. My daily prayers go up to God, the Father of all mercies, that my countrymen may not thus perish by the edge of the sword.

Bitter as it is, it is nevertheless true, of which you write, that our Most Gracious King has enlisted an army, to be led against his own Scots, (now, alas, not his own,) that he has taken command of the new levies, and is now with his army in the northern part of the kingdom, prepared to repress their insolencies. But as he has hitherto tried every method, by which he might reduce these rebels to reason, so I have not the slightest doubt, that, if they will henceforth act, as safety, honor and loyalty require, and as the religion of Christ, and the laws of the country make a duty, our most clement monarch will let every thing else be buried in oblivion, how flagitious soever it may have been.

As to other matters, your most acceptable epistle separates itself into two parts. One is, that you do not at all take upon yourselves the function of reviewing, or judging, in our affairs; and that you have no desire whatever, to thrust your sickle into another's harvest. But this harvest is not altogether another's, most pious brethren. For your letter commences with these very words, "If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it." So then the body is one, otherwise the members could not belong to the same body; and in so far as it is one, it cannot be a body of aliens. But you cannot escape the functions of reviewers; for you declare that is everybody's talk, (while the letters of your friends confirm it,) that nothing sadder than our broils could have happened to the entire Reformed Church.

Perhaps, however, you employ the words *review*, and *judge*, in a forensic sense. If so, I really wish you would take to yourselves a judge's part; and as, in a friendly and pacific way, you have sent letters to England, so you would also send letters to the conspirators of Scotland, to induce them to obey their king—to uphold such a power in the Crown, in matters ecclesiastical, as was exercised by the best kings among the Jews—to condemn their armed resistance, to powers ordained by God, under pretext of religion; a thing unheard of in the times of the Primitive Church—to condemn I say; since they are condemned by your letters and opinions, and by those of all the Reformed Churches. For so far has the rebellious audacity of these confederates gone, as to have outstripped even that of the Jesuits; and there is nothing now left, which they may not attempt against their native-born and most placable prince, for the sake (ostensibly) of God and religion. And (I know not whether it is most to be deplored or execrated) so powerfully is the enemy of the human race at work among them, that the actual ringleaders in our tumults are their ministers; while nothing so much, as the suggestions of these very ministers, animates them in their opposition to our most conscientious monarch.* I return to the word *condemn*; for

* There is more point in the word *conscientious*, than a common reader would suppose. Conscience was the grand plea of the Puritan; forgetting, all the while, that other people had consciences, as well as himself.

this rebellion is so grievous, and so hateful to even the moderately wise, that I fear the whole Reformed Church will have the worst possible reputation, among all now living, and among posterity, unless something be written, and that publicly, against this disgraceful conspiracy towards princes. Nor can our perils, whatever they may become, so make the Reformed Church an object of profane triumph and mockery, as these perpetually sprouting scandals subject religion itself to every species of infamy.

There is another hint, which you give me with genuine Swiss candor, and an affection for Britain, by no means a new thing, but descended to you from your forefathers, *viz.*, that by the perils of intestine war, and for my own reputation and peace of conscience, I would so act, that these difficulties may be settled, not by violence, but by royal influence and clemency. That I would so act! Change, O, change, I beseech you, that sentiment. For if I could so act—no sooner said than done. I call God to witness, and his anointed King, and the Royal Senate, privy to the King's most secret counsels, and as many as were ever present there—that I have ever devoted myself to counsels for peace, only and always, in private and in public. Nay, more. And that, almost alone, have I contended (aye, contended) by arguments and prayers, with our most conscientious King, to obtain this end, *viz.*, that every condition of peace might once, and again, and again, be offered to the rebels among the Scots, [he does not say, rebellious Scots,] which either a king could grant with honor, or they, with any pretence of justice, expect. Nor do I yet desist; but, as faithfully as I can, suggest peace, that the rebels prove not enemies to themselves as well as us, and, I fear, greater enemies to peace than to us or to themselves. And what, I pray you, can such imbecility as mine effect, in straits like these; when one has to deal with men, who either want no peace at all, or such a peace as Royal Majesty could never grant. And if, in the mean time, any one represents me to you as an enemy to peace, (for I know I am hated by both factions,) I pray God to show him mercy and to grant me patience.

Meanwhile, I leave this in sacred trust with you. I declare the very truth, when I say, that as I have been until now, so shall I be hereafter, most assiduous for peace; provided it can be obtained on any just conditions. And may God, in whose hands the hearts of kings are, grant to our most pacific sovereign, that he may adopt those counsels only which will be salutary, acceptable to Heaven, glorious to himself, safe for the kingdom, advantageous to the Church Universal. For yourselves, I invoke on you every felicity and grace in this world, and glory in the world to come.

Given at Lambeth Palace the last day of April, 1639.

This letter betrays Laud's fraternal intimacies with another class of continental Protestants, men of Helvetian mettle—not Calvinistic simply; but, in their views of Sacramental religion, of a decided Zwinglian complexion. Yet they too, it seems, at their remote distance from England, (a distance by no means to be measured by modern facilities,) make discovery of the grand peculiarity of Laud's character, as well as Clarendon. He could be reasoned with, and remonstrated with, even on the archiepiscopal throne of Canterbury; and that, too, about people whom, it is supposed, he detested, much more than he did the murderer from the beginning. They *do* approach him with earnest and resolute pleadings; such, as it appears by the tenor of his answer, they had not ventured, perhaps had not dared, to expend upon their brother Presbyterians!

And what an answer do they receive! He comes down from his towering elevation to their own level. They are most learned pastors and professors, of churches and schools,—they are fellows, they are brethren—they are not beloved friends simply, but *charissimi*, most dear to him. He hears their every word; he weighs their every argument; he cons their every omen; he is stirred by their every appeal; and he replies like a man to his fellows, from a full, and by manifest self-consciousness, a wholly, and throughout, and every way honest heart.

If a liar, or a deceiver, or a prevaricator, could write such an epistle, then we despair of human nature; and the sun will never shine upon translucent integrity again. And such an epistle, therefore, we beg all, not steeped in prejudice to their very lips; into whose bones it has not penetrated, like empyreumatic oil, till their very souls smell of it—such an epistle, with this exception, we beg all to read, as Laud's abashing vindication against a thousand slanders. He was a mistaken man, no doubt. He was an irascible man; that is as little dubious. He was an impulsive man, beyond a moment's question. But he was a most misconceived, and misinterpreted, and unendured man. He was a provoked, a hampered, a pestered, a calumniated, an execrated man. Accusations, and lampoons, and libels poured upon him like the sheets of a northeastern storm, in a New England spring, piercing, ceaseless, pitiless. He had been an angel, if he had always preserved his equanimity. Of course, then, he had paroxysms. But when the fit abated, and the fumes of passion evaporated; when the serenity of reason irradiated his thoughts, and calmness reasserted her dominion; then we see him, in the plenitude of sincerity, speaking to those whom he might have thrust aside with a scoff or a sneer, as if they had the amplest rights to scan his motives, aims, and struggles. And if such a man is not to be believed; if such a man's words may not stand for (in its old sense) his apology; then we say, away with trust in anybody, and let suspicion be as comprehensive, and as unsparing, as it is in the breast of one who deals with duplicities of all sorts, till probably his own heart often disbelieves his own lips—we mean the Captain General of the Jesuits!

NO. XVI.

MOST EXCELLENT SIR:

A year has elapsed since your former letters (which I did not answer) reached me. But it was one of the busiest of years, in which I could neither write, nor breathe, with freedom. The King had gone to the North. Business, in

his absence, pressed upon myself and others. Pacification has there ensued, but I fear it will not be lasting. After the King's return, cabinet councils were called; Parliament summoned, convened, dissolved, neither the business of the King or of the Kingdom settled. Immediately after the dissolution of Parliament, a seditious and furious insurrection of men without employment, and from the lowest orders of society, was made against me. At least five hundred besieged my house at the dead of night; but, God be thanked, in vain. Convocation, *i. e.* our National Synod, followed; that, if possible, ecclesiastical affairs might not create disturbances, nor religion, as is everywhere the custom, be made a cloak of. Meanwhile, the rattle of arms was sounding in our ears. Amid such circumstances, affecting in the worst way, one so desirous of peace as I am, how could I so much as think of your letters, otherwise always most acceptable! But to pass by those things, which have distracted me, *[hiatus.]*

You have no idea how many, and how great the commotions, which Scotch affairs have made in England. There are furious innovators about us, whose aims I am aware of. How far they may be permitted to go, God only knows. Concerning these I have no leisure or inclination to write, lest my paper become absolutely black with gall; when I see my name and reputation everywhere, (even among foreigners,) torn to tatters, and polluted by their virulent pens. I return, therefore, to private affairs, *[hiatus.]*

I send, by Junius, my book published last year, but in the English tongue. I confess that I promised it to you in Latin; and herein I am not unfaithful to you, but myself deceived.* For a man of ample learning and leisure took this in hand, and, to be candid, finished it. But when I examined it, a short time after, I found not a few places, in which he had not reached my meaning, and very many, in which he had not reached my style of expression. And I thought it much better to suppress a translation, which neither represented me nor my sentiments, than to publish one by which foreigners, who are unacquainted with the English language, would look at me through a false medium. If, however, it can be corrected, you may yet look for it; but I fear the negligence of a translator more than his pen. With this book I send you the Canons, lately established by our Synod, [Convocation,] that you may see I have neither deserted the Church, nor the old paths of the Church.

It remains, that I commend you to God and His grace; and implore you, that in these times, when a revolution is sought after, as well by subtlety as by violence, you will address unwearied prayers to God our Saviour, to preserve in safety your servant, and, most learned Sir, your devoted friend,

WILLIAM CANTERBURY.

Lambeth Palace, August 31, 1640.

Laud was sent to the Tower, March 1, 1641. We know how his manuscripts were looked after there, by the lynx eyes of William Prynne, who wrote the folio to destroy him, called "Canterburie's Doome." Possibly, then, this was the last communication on earth, between the beleaguered prelate and his affectionate friend; unless it be the letter from that friend which follows, and which, for several reasons, we are constrained to insert.

No. XVII.

MOST REV. FATHER IN GOD, AND MOST ILLUSTRIOUS SIR:

I have received from my kinsman Junius, your double gift, which at its weight in gold would not be costly, because each part is all gold. I allude to the

* See his punctilious truth-telling.

constitutions and canons of the Councils of Canterbury and York, and to the Conference between yourself, then Bishop of St. David's, and the Jesuit Fisher. Each of these works is, in my judgment, enough, at least ought to be enough, to refute all the calumnies which have been leveled against the Church of England, and her prelates, (yourself especially, Most Rev. Sir,) by malevolent men, who are striving for this one end above all others—to make odious, as soon as may be, all who are addicted to the Primitive Church, and are tenacious of her doctrines and constitutions,* because they themselves measure everything by the self-will of later generations. To me, each of these works will always be a treasure; and, in fact, in the very short time I have had them, they have been serviceable in restraining the malignant and confirming the moderate. Most truly, far other rumors have been disseminated, than these books authorize. I was desirous, had it been permitted me, to send to you, by my kinsman on his return, my very elaborate works concerning the Nature of God and Things, [*hiatus*.] Meanwhile, we shall not cease to pour out our prayers for his most gracious Lord, the King; and, in fine, that God will inspire the erring (not to use a harsher phrase) with gentler dispositions.

The day after the Nones of October, Gregorian Style, 1640.

The ever most devoted admirer of your Most Rev. and Illustrious name,

GERARD JOHN VOSSIUS.

We have added but this one letter of Vossius, when we might gladly have translated the whole, if ourselves had time and our readers patience. It seemed necessary in a measure, however, to give a specimen of the manner in which Vossius was accustomed to address his High-Church correspondent; and, more especially, to identify the book Laud had alluded to, as one of his own productions. It appears, then, that notwithstanding "far other rumors" to the contrary, thick as autumn's leaves in a whirlwind, Laud was lacking in no will, and losing no opportunity, to inflict on Rome every species of discomfiture. He turns such emissaries as Davenport out of doors with scanty ceremony—perhaps slams the door after them. He employs Presbyterian auxiliaries to do that, for which, as some critics, whom we scent from afar, will say, he ought much rather to have gone to Oxford or to Cambridge. Finally, he enters the lists himself; nor so only, but sends his weapons out of England, to help Presbyterians, as well as Churchmen, to do battle in the contest, which, with him, as with all, thorough theologians, is the grand pitched battle of Christendom:—a battle which narrow observers think began in Luther's time; but which the Greeks *really* began, as far back as the Council of Sardica, fifteen hundred years ago,† and in which we ought *now* to have the Greeks coöoperating, if we are ever—ever—EVER—to bring it to an end. In such a

* An old fashioned word, equivalent to what we now call *discipline*. The learned will excuse this note.

† Even Gibbon saw this clearly. *Milman's Gibbon*, iii. 361; or Chap. xxi, near note 115, for any edition.

mighty conflict, Laud, who had the comprehensiveness of a *genuine* Catholic, bounded not his views by his immediate communion. He sought the friendship and the assistance of foreigners—foreigners, as some would call them, not in a political sense alone. He would influence such, not by his zealous words only, but by his laborious example. He sends them a book, redolent, in its every syllable, with Anti-Romish lore. And that book has earned laurels for him, even by the testimony of a Puritan. Said Sir Edward Dering, and in the face of the very Parliament which sent crown and mitre alike into the pit of destruction, “His book lately set forth, especially for the latter half thereof, hath muzzled the Jesuit, and shall strike the Papists under the fifth rib, when he is dead and gone. And, being dead, Paul's will be his perpetual monument, and his own book his lasting epitaph.”†

And here we are admonished to think of relinquishing our interesting subject, though deserving a much longer and more luminous illustration, than we have found time or capacity, with which to dignify or demonstrate it. Questionless our labors will not please any onesided mind, of any Ecclesiastical nomenclature, and may receive more than one filip from the arm, if not the armor of righteousness, on the right hand and on the left. Well, if it must be so, we cannot help it, and must abide the award, if such is our predestinate due. We have long entertained conceptions, which we cannot mend, about the solemnity and sacredness of the fidelity which belongs to history; and must let facts be their own voicers, whether their tones be loud or soft, sweet or grating. *Fiat justitia ruat coelum.*

William Laud was not altogether such a man, as high-church partisans, or low-church partisans, have accounted him. *Like most or all divines, who look more to the general, than to the sectional interests of religion, he will never be understood or appreciated by extremists of any name.* But if there was, so to speak, a syllogistic conviction, which, more than any other mastered his mind, and guided his policy, it was this:—That the most venerable antiquity was the only safe ground for the common weal of Christians;—That Rome, with her imperious novelties, was the great obstacle to the unity and prosperity of the Holy Catholic Church;—And that Puritanism, and any other factious division of the forces of Protestants, was an indirect promoter of Rome's comprehensive,

† *Dering's Speeches*, p. 3. London, 1642. One can easily see the same propensity in Dering, not uncommon still. He will say Paul's, and not St. Paul's.

all-grasping, aims. And the present aspect of Christian affairs proves him to have been a profounder religious statesman, than the most partial of his contemporaries might have dreamed. That aspect is making it, plainer and plainer, that there is no common ground on which to fight against Rome, and stave off her supremacy, but that of the Faith and the Discipline, the Creeds and the Episcopacy, of the first four ecumenical Councils—Councils which even the Cambridge Confession hesitated not to honor for doctrine;* alas, that it could not hail them welcome for discipline too. To this standard, Puritanism, and all other *isms*, must return and cling; or the issue is as inevitable as the law of gravity. If there is not more of centralization, and less of disruption among Protestants, they will prove their own worst enemies; and Rome may at length look superciliously down upon their self-wrought desolations, and exclaim, like the mystic city of the Apocalypse, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and sorrow I shall not see."†

* *Boston Edition*, 1829, page 72.

† *Douay Bible*, Rev. xviii, 7.

ART. V.—THE LATE GENERAL CONVENTION.

Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, MDCCCLIII. Together with the Constitution and Canons.

OUR readers have long since gained, from newspaper reports and comments, a tolerably correct idea of what was said and done at the late General Convention. The Journal before us details its proceedings, with exact and official formality. We propose to contribute our part towards a still better understanding of the results at which the Convention arrived, by embracing, in one view, those more important features of the Session, which indicate its spirit, and the influence it is likely to have over the future history of the Church.

The General Convention is not only a familiar thing to us, but, like its name, is modern. It belongs to our day. We stand in no awe of it, for we know all about its secret machinery. In the popular estimation, it is a Baltimore or Cleveland Convention over again, except that Religion, instead of Politics or Science, is its subject. To a very considerable extent, our own clergy and people see the Convention in its modern, business-like aspect, full of talk, rules of order, and routine, meaning to do good, yet not without a threatening of mischief. And this is certainly its outward look, as part of a familiar system, as subjected to the petty influences of the day, as made up of so many common place and undignified details, that we cannot pretend to regard it with profound and distant reverence.

A moment's thoughtful observation, however, shows it in another light. We see its place in the ecclesiastical history of Christendom as being, to this age and country, what, for instance, the Council of Elliberis was to Spain, or of Carthage to Africa. It occupies the space in history allotted to those assemblages, which no portion of the Church has ever been without, except where the State has interfered to prevent them. From this brown-paper covered pamphlet before us, the chain runs back unbroken to the acts of the earliest Council that were recorded on parchment, and placed among the archives of the Church. Circumstances change greatly, in-

deed, as we go back. It strikes the mind that there is no identity when the age, the scene, and the men are so different. On the open page on the one hand we read ; " New York, October 6, 1853. This being the day and place appointed for the meeting of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Divine Service was celebrated in Trinity Church." One glance on the other hand shows us the historian's words ; " A General Council of all the African provinces was held at Carthage, on the ninth of the Calends of September, under the Consulate of Theodosius the Younger and Rumoridus ; Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage, presided." That which we imagine the one to have been, it seems hardly possible that the other really is ; yet they are substantially the same, in principle, functions and constitution. The very office which the one performed for Northern Africa, the other was called on to fulfill towards our own country.

But what Provincial Council or assemblage of all the provinces in any one region of the ancient Empire, had a trust committed to it, equal to that of building up the Church in the larger part of this vast continent ; what opportunity was ever presented to the Heads of the Churches in any one nation, to be compared, in present magnitude and future prospects, with that which opens before the assembled representatives of dioceses, that stretch between two oceans for 3000 miles, and for as many more, from the cold streams of the Aroostook and the Upper Mississippi, to where the Rio Grande pours forth its tepid waters beneath a tropical sun ? The largest division of the ancient Church was included in the Exarchate of Africa, lying in a narrow strip along the Northern coast of that continent, for some 12 or 1500 miles. Small as this whole district is, compared with our country, it is not with the General Council of all its six provinces that our own Convention is to be ranked, so much as with the still smaller assemblage of each province. To this body seems to have been committed that minute and perpetual oversight of the affairs of the province, and that special responsibility for its welfare in all particulars, which corresponds most nearly with the functions of the General Convention. This latter assemblage serves also as a metropolitan Council to act in greater matters, but in its ordinary aspect, it most resembles the Council of the province. Not only every Bishop, but every Diocese is present in it, and introduces its own affairs, which arrangement is strictly provincial. As a provincial Synod then, our Convention holds a position of unequaled responsi-

bility. In instituting this comparison, we are not to look merely at the number of dioceses, and of their clergy and people, under these different circumstances; we are to bear in mind how great a nation is forming in this country, from the combined materials of every race in Europe, with no slight infusion of African blood, and even now inviting a new element from Asia. We are to think of the activity, energy, and rapid increase of this people—their power multiplied in every way by the science and art of these extraordinary times. We are to anticipate the millions that are to throng, where only thousands are now sparsely scattered. We are to form some estimate of the proportion that the dioceses, clergy and Churches are to bear to the increase of population, from the indications of the growth of the Church during the last fifty years—gaining, as she has done, upon the population over and above her natural increase, and that, not by importation, but by the flocking of the American people to her fold, as doves to their windows. We are to discern this opportunity, unequaled in the history of Christendom; to reflect on the foresight, promptness, industry and wisdom that are needed to prepare for and secure it. We are to turn then to the work already in hand, to the adjustment of the details of the Church's daily life over so wide a region, amid so many varieties and peculiarities of places and people, to the necessity of adapting the ancient principles and system of the Church, to cases that are continually occurring of an unprecedented nature. These are the conditions under which every meeting of the General Convention must be held, and by which we may estimate its importance on any occasion.

The interval of three years, however, that had just passed, had brought a heavy increase of responsibility to the late Convention. It was felt that upon what occurred at its meetings, depended the renewal of dissensions sharper than ever, or the healing and reviving exhibition of self-restraint and mutual forbearance, of coöperation in the Church's work, to the disparagement of the supposed obligations of party. The *prestige* of the Episcopal office had years before been grievously marred, and late events had not tended to restore it to its once high place. It was evident that another gale of passion would effectually dissipate the illusion, as men were beginning to deem it, and there were fears that the storm was brewing to break forth at the Convention. The miserable defection of one who had been foremost among the Bishops, was itself a blow at the confidence reposed in them, and called for action suitable to the emergency. There was

an undefined apprehension, lest theological and personal antipathies would seize upon an occasion so favorable to their indulgence. Besides these sources of anxiety, there was a general depression in the missionary and other practical operations of the Church, for relief from which it was natural to look to the Convention. Nor were reasons wanting for concern of a very different sort, in the distinct call which was providentially made upon the Convention, to meet the wants of the age and country, by vigorous measures, to adapt and apply the principles of the Church to existing and fast increasing exigencies. A total failure to recognize and answer this call, would have been almost to quench her light. An unwise zeal might commit her to measures that would only waste her strength, and forfeit her opportunity. Nor must we fail to say, that even the anticipated visit of our English brethren, while it rejoiced so many hearts, stirred some with apprehensions, lest this movement towards the practical and visible union of the Churches, should, in its first steps, be marred in some way, for which the composition of a body like the General Convention, suggested ample possibilities.

Thus was the field of her duties spread around her, and thus checkered was the sky above, when the heads of her dioceses, and the representatives of her clergy and people, assembled in Trinity Church, in the city of New York, at the opening of her great Council. It was due to the forethought of the Provisional Bishop of New York, that the services were celebrated in a church, so well adapted to the impressiveness and dignity of the occasion. The Rev. Mr. Caswall, of the English Deputation, in a letter to a London newspaper, has well described the scene, as it appeared to him. As we write for distant readers in our own country, who may not be familiar with the place in which this striking scene occurred, we quote his description at length. It will have more of freshness and interest, moreover, as coming from such a source, than any description of our own.

"At ten o'clock I went to Trinity Church to attend the opening solemnities of the General Convention. The Church was erected about twelve years since on the site of the first Church belonging to our communion in New York. There is a very fine clerestory, and a noble steeple and spire, containing a musical peal of eight bells. There are no galleries excepting that which supports the organ, a truly magnificent instrument of vast power and compass. The chancel is not sufficiently deep, but the large window over the altar is, perhaps, thirty four feet high, and is rich with painted glass. All the windows of the Church are of a similar character, and the bright American sun gleaming through the various-colored compartments casts variegated hues upon the walls, the floor, and the assembled multitude. Trinity Church stands in the business part of the city, from which the wealthy inhabitants have migrated. Hence the congregation is, in a great mea-

sure, composed of strangers sojourning in those vast hotels which are the real palaces of this republican and locomotive nation. Soon after I had taken my seat, the bells chimed forth their lively peals in honor of the General Convention of the Western Church. The sound swelled high above the heavy roll of the omnibuses and other vehicles in Broadway, and the members of the Convention, with many hundreds of visitors, were seen entering in small parties, (as they were admitted by the doorkeepers,) and proceeding to their appointed seats. Before the hour of service, the noble building was thronged by a congregation which I estimated at fifteen hundred. I saw among them many of my old friends and contemporaries, whom I recognized after the lapse of from twelve years to a quarter of a century. Their heads had become gray, and the marks of advancing age were on their features; but, upon the whole, they were little altered, nor did their bodily vigor appear to be abated. Among these were persons of commanding talent as writers, or of high influence as statesmen, as jurists, and as philosophers. Thankfully I recognized the fact that, although numerically not the largest body of professed Christians in America, the Church in this country is eminently powerful in its weight of character and ability. The organ began a solemn strain, and a noble procession entered, consisting of thirty Bishops in full canonicals, and a number of priests and deacons in surplices. The presiding Bishop (Dr. Brownell, of Connecticut) took his place at the right of the altar, with Bishop Spencer (late of Madras) on his right hand. The other Bishops occupied sedilia on both sides of the chancel. At the extreme left of the semicircle thus formed, sat Archdeacon Sinclair, and at the extreme right was the Rev. Mr. Howe, Secretary of the Lower House of Convention. In front of these, facing the altar, was a row of deacons in surplices. The English deputation occupied the front seat on the right of the eagle, the members of the Convention, lay and clerical, occupied the pews on both sides of the middle aisle, and the rest of the Church was densely crowded by an attentive congregation. The appearance of the Bishops was very striking. They seemed to be vigorous and active men, and generally were of a good figure and a commanding stature. Their countenances expressed intelligence and thoughtfulness, combined with habits of business and application. There was Bishop Doane, with gray hairs, but with eyes full of animation. Here was the stalwart form of Bishop M'Cosky; here was the amiable countenance of Bishop Kemper; there stood Bishop M'Ilvaine, reverend with the frost of advancing age; and there was Bishop Polk, the instructor of the negroes and the friend of the slave. The presiding Bishop closely resembled our own venerable prelate of Gloucester; Bishop Otey, of Tennessee, was conspicuous by his manly and noble bearing; Bishop Meade was venerable by his years; Bishop Boone was known as the persevering missionary in China; Bishop DeLancey was remembered in connection with the American deputation of 1852; Bishop Spencer carried our thoughts to the remote East; and the Bishops of Kentucky, Indiana, Missouri, and Mississippi, reminded us of the vast regions of the far West, and of scenes of severe labor undergone for Christ and the Gospel. Morning prayer was read by the Secretary of the Lower House, the lessons by the Rev. Dr. Mend, and the litany and prayer for the Convention by Archdeacon Sinclair.* The presiding Bishop took the chief part in the communion service, and the sermon was preached by Bishop M'Ilvaine, from the text, "The harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few," &c. The bread and the wine were placed on the altar by Bishop Wainwright, and the consecration was performed by the presiding Bishop. The scene was most striking when the thirty Bishops knelt around the altar in the act of communicating. The great

* Mr. Caswall, in the above account, has not noted the very striking and significant circumstance, that this noble prayer for the assembled Council was offered for the first time by a dignitary of the English Church. It seemed as if we heard her voice praying for us. It was our privilege to be kneeling at the time almost by the side of Archdeacon Sinclair, and we are sure that the sudden tremulousness and increased fervor of his tones, showed that he felt, as many others did, the peculiar significance of the Prayer, on his life.

window above represented the forms of our Lord and His Apostles, while beneath, the actual representatives of the Apostles were commemorating their Redeemer's death. The Bishops afterwards administered the communion to about five hundred of the clergy and laity. Divine service having closed, the business of the Convention commenced in the same place. The Bishops retired to the vestry, and organized the Upper House. The Lower House was organized in the Church itself. The Chairman and Secretary of the last Convention were re-elected, and the roll was called by dioceses, as in the Convocation of the province of Canterbury. After a little more routine business, the Convocation adjourned, to meet in St. John's Church on the following day. In the afternoon, Bishop Wainwright invited all the Bishops and all the clerical and lay delegates to meet the English deputation at his own house. The party was large—indeed, a regular ecclesiastical crush. Here I had the honor and the pleasure of renewing my ancient acquaintance with many a noble-minded and self-denying American Churchman. Nothing could be more truly fraternal than the manner in which the deputation was welcomed by the brethren of the West."

There is nothing to be added to the above description, except the thought that, on that day was present, on American soil, to unite in the celebration of the Eucharist, according to the American Ritual, the most Catholic assemblage that the Reformed Communion has ever witnessed. The two great divisions of that Communion were there met together, the former through a Deputation that unquestionably received the sanction of the great bulk of her members. An intelligent Laity were there, zealous to bear their part in the work before them. There were the Bishops and Clergy of thirty Dioceses. There, was an unfettered Church with no external impediment whatever in the way of her attempting to fulfill *all* her Master's will. The Apostles themselves had no such opportunity, for the jealous and cruel Empire stood over against them. Well might Mr. Caswall reflect, as he looked round in St. John's Chapel the next day—"these men have power to alter the Prayer-Book, to shape Canons as they please, to form ecclesiastical alliances, to send forth Bishops, to station Missionaries in almost every part of the Globe. These men may lift themselves above the trammels of party, and aim at the highest achievements within the sphere of mortal man."

Having entered happily on its labors by promptness and unanimity in the preliminary measures of organization, the Convention continued to sit till the eighteenth day. A glance at the Index to the Journal, will suffice to show the great variety of business that occupied the two Houses for so long a time. Yet, by far the greater part of the Session was consumed in the discussion of comparatively a few matters. It will enable us better to appreciate the responsibility, the difficulties, and the results of the Session we are reviewing, if we mention in one sentence that it had to discuss such subjects as a proper provision for the neglected but vast regions on the Pacific shore, the abandonment

of the Diocese of North Carolina by its Bishop, and his defection to Rome, the whole question of the judicial system of the Church, a radical change in the qualifications for and position of the Diaconate, and the institution of measures that should lead to active intercourse and practical unity between the Churches of England and America. We cannot be thankful enough to the HOLY SPIRIT who guides the Church, that such matters were handled with singular quietness and moderation, though with earnestness. Reflecting how very seldom even great opportunities vouchsafed to men are understood and fully adequately or faithfully used by them, we shall not be disappointed—far otherwise, we shall be encouraged by the proportion which the actual results of the Session bear to its protracted discussions, and its omissions, or postponement of important matters to a future day.

There were several ways in which the Convention might have taken hold of a matter so painful as the defection of Bishop Ives, that would only have added to its painfulness, and made it as unhappy in its results as it was at the outset. It could hardly have surprised any one, if it had been seized upon by some, as a convenient and providential handle to work injury to the cause of theological opponents; if indiscreet zeal had come forward with ill-digested propositions, that would only have added fuel to party heats, and embarrassed the question with needless issues; if others again had been driven into untenable positions, from which the violence of opposition would hardly have allowed them to retreat. All this, and more, might have happened, and was foremost in the thoughts of many when the event occurred, that might have occasioned so much mischief beyond what has already followed it. These apprehensions subsided, indeed, as the Convention approached, but the grounds for them were not so removed, but that we may look back upon the very different course the matter took, as an evident token of the Providence of God over the Convention; as one of the happiest instances of the good temper that prevailed. The painful subject was approached in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies with manifest reserve and caution. Early in the second day's sitting, the testimonials of the Bishop-elect of North Carolina were referred, immediately on presentation, to the Standing Committee on Consecrations. The same course was taken on the next day, when an official statement of the difficulties between the diocese of North Carolina and its late Bishop was presented by one of its clerical deputies. The natural expectation on the part of the lower House that the Bishops would,

in due time, take decided steps in regard to an event that so nearly concerned them, was fulfilled when, on the fourth day, a proposed Canon was sent down embodying the principle, that any Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon, who should abandon the communion of the Church, and join himself to any other religious body, would thereby cut himself off from the rights and privileges of his order. The Canon provided for the formal announcement of his deposition, without need of further witness than his own acknowledged act. This measure, that must have struck every mind instantly as of the gravest import, was, without debate, referred to the Committee on Canons, with instructions to confer with the Bishops in relation to the subject. As the result of their mutual consultations, on the morning of the fifth day, the Committee reported the Canon, with an amendment, providing for a delay of three months, in cases where evidence of the abandonment does not come directly from the person himself, that notice may be given him to show cause against his deposition. At a later period of the same day, a proposal was made to make an existing Canon applicable to the case, with a view of avoiding a special Canon aimed at Bishop Ives. It was referred to the Committee, the whole subject having been previously made the order of the day for the next day's session, at one o'clock P. M. Before that hour arrived it was again brought before the House by a majority, and a minority report from the Committee on Consecrations; the former declaring that Dr. Atkinson's papers were in due form and valid, and that no impediment existed to his consecration, the diocese having been vacated; the latter, insisting that there were impediments, and that the diocese could not be vacated, except in the way already prescribed. After a brief conversation, the Committee withdrew their report for the purpose of modifying it. At the appointed hour, the discussion of the proposed Canon and amendments was begun, and continued through the day's sitting, with great earnestness and ability, and with strong but subdued feeling. A set of resolutions was introduced, expressing the views of those who thought that, till the Bishops formally decided the question of vacancy, the diocese had no power to elect, and abstaining from any reference to the future position of the recusant Bishop. There were thus two distinct propositions before the House, one going much further than the other: the one, simply aiming to meet the special difficulty in the diocese of North Carolina; the other, enacting a law to apply to all cases that might hereafter unhappily occur. On these two propositions, and others connected

with them, the lower House was employed for the greater part of the sixth, seventh, and eighth days. Adverse opinions were urged in relation to the first proposition by those, on the one hand, who thought that a vacancy had been effected in the diocese of North Carolina by its Bishop's abdication, as absolute as if by his death; on the other hand by those who believed the diocese to be virtually vacant, but not formally so till the Bishops had so adjudged and declared it. The second proposition was also opposed, with deeper feeling by those who shrank from inflicting, even on a recusant, the severe sentence of deposition. A result could not be speedily reached through such conflicting views and powerful emotions, but expressed as they were with only becoming earnestness and in good temper, they did not unreasonably protract it. Various independent propositions were withdrawn by their authors; the Committee on Canons withdrew their own amendment, providing for a delay of three months; an amendment that looked to a restoration of the recusant, within a given period, and under certain restrictions, was voted down, and the Canon as originally framed by the Bishops, with the alteration of a single important word,* was passed. A message was soon received from the Bishops, that they had concurred in its passage, and thus, the great difficulty that had arisen in the Church was solved, the scandal was potentially removed. It only remained that the special case that had caused this anxious thought and protracted labor, should be disposed of under the new Canon.

Accordingly, towards the close of the next day's session, the announcement was made that the Bishops were ready to pronounce sentence on their delinquent brother, in the presence of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. As they entered, the members of the House, and the assembled congregation rose, and though their appearance was hardly in the formal and official style that the occasion demanded, yet the deep impressiveness of the event itself, the unutterable thoughts it could not fail to suggest, the recollection of what the person chiefly concerned had been to the Church in past days, contrasted with his present position, mingling, in that one moment, David's grief of heart at the loss of Jonathan, with his bitter lamentation over Absalom's fall, the most appropriate prayers that were offered, the sentence that was solemnly uttered by the presiding Bishop, in the tremulous voice of age—must all have contributed to make

* The Canon referred to an open renunciation of the doctrine, discipline, or worship of this Church. The word "or" was changed to "and."

the scene awful to those who witnessed. The wording of the sentence, apart from the enumeration of names and titles, was simple, dignified, and becoming the occasion. It made the true impression, which the Canon distinctly intended, that he who quits the Communion of the Reformed Church in this land, for that of any separated or hostile body, does not simply "transfer himself from one portion of the Lord's vineyard to another,"* but directly violates the law of Catholic unity itself.

Of one aspect of this distressing affair, the proceedings in Convention made no account. It is one that has already been set forth, in the pages of this Review. It is present, with painful distinctness, to the minds of many. Had it received due allowance, the action of the Convention would have satisfied some, who still doubt whether justice has been done, in the application of the sound principle of the Canon, to the particular case that called for action. The question, how far the state of mind of the late Bishop of North Carolina, made him justly amenable to the full severity of the Canon, is not yet determined. Our own opinion is, that if future events should make it appear that a wrong has been done, that the case is one to which the Canon, though formed for the occasion, was not designed to apply—in such an issue, the Church, in the plenitude of her power to undo all wrong and dispense full justice to every one, would annul this sentence, or render it more conformable to the facts of the case, if facts they should prove to be. There are those who will say that the possibility of such a contingency, should have prevented such a sentence. We should have been better satisfied in our minds, had it been only considered, though, under the circumstances, we are not disposed to discuss the question, any further.

The discussions to which the above mentioned transactions had given rise, were in some respects continued after the particular matter had been disposed of. An amendment was proposed to the Canon, entitled, "of a minister renouncing the ministry, and abandoning the Communion of this Church." A distinct but kindred Canon was also proposed, in reference to the abandonment of the Church by a Bishop. The effect of the latter Canon would have been, to separate the legal consequences of such a step on a Bishop's part, into those which concerned the diocese, and those which concerned himself; making the former to consist in the *ipso facto* vacating

* In substance, Dr. Pusey's remarks of Mr. Newman.

his Diocese, and the latter, in his deposition after three month's notice, and with the consent of three Bishops. The other Canon embraced many details, but its distinguishing feature was, that liberty was granted to one who had abandoned the Church, to return to his official station, on certain conditions. There were no measures brought before the Convention that took so many forms, that were so often postponed and called up again, sent from one House to the other for concurrence, and non-concurred in, as these. They were pressed on the one hand with unwearied pertinacity, and on the other, met with as lively a jealousy of their principles and practical working. The issue at last was, that the Canon relating to a Bishop was dropped, and the Canon of 1853, under which Bishop Ives was deposed, remains in full force. In regard to a Presbyter or Deacon, it was enacted, that three month's notice should be given, in case there was no evidence of his act in writing under his own hand, before his Bishop should pronounce his deposition. The House of Deputies, after a struggle, and against a large minority vote, passed the Canon, readmitting to his functions a recusant minister, if within five years he applied for admission, and if two-thirds of the Bishops should consent, but subsequently, when the Bishops non-concurred, a majority could not be obtained in favor of a Committee of Conference. Thus the point so zealously contended for, was not won. The position which the Church had previously assumed was maintained.

The motives that were urged upon the Convention, with a view to a different result, were, first, and mainly, that it was unmerciful to shut the door forever against the offender's return; and secondly, that it was inexpedient to do so, since thus the Church might lose valuable services, the more valuable, some appeared to think, because of the enlarged experience which a visit to Rome would afford.

The reply to these arguments was, substantially, that deposition was no more than a just punishment for an offense so aggravated, and that mercy to the flock, as well as to the offender, called for treatment fully proportioned to the greatness of the scandal and the sin. As to its expediency, it was urged that, in the present state of Christendom, the danger of unsettling men's minds, and giving them opportunity for the fearful experiment of submission to a hostile communion, was more to be regarded than any loss the Church might sustain from refusing the renewed offer of their services.

There is one view of the subject, in which, it seems to us, we may well find reason to be satisfied, that the strin-

gency of the Canon was not relaxed. There is a vast difference between an offense that merely brings out the eccentricities of the individual, and one which reveals the weakness and erratic tendencies of a class: between the exceptional cases which, in settled times, move the mass of observers to astonishment or pity, and those which, amid prevalent disorders, tend immediately to increase the vacillation or perplexity of the multitude. Under the former state of things the community can be very lenient, if not indifferent, to the delusions or perversities of an individual, no matter how subtle or extravagant they may be. His example is not likely to move others. His madness is not infectious. Even his criminality is lessened by the fact, that nothing beforehand could have led him to consider how many would be involved in the consequences of his false step, were he to make one. No probable results, except such as were personal to himself, could have been present to his mind. But in the latter case, the likelihood and frequency of the offense, the magnitude of its evil results, render it a very serious matter. The community has no longer to deal with eccentricity. There is no reliance to be placed on the settled state of the public mind, on the healthiness of the general tone of feeling, on the general acknowledgment of certain fixed and obvious facts. The very contrary condition of things exists, and special pains must be taken both to make and to keep the truth and the right manifest; to provide that the truth shall not be obscured, nor the right transgressed, with impunity. The adoption of stringent measures becomes then a necessity; the only open question is as to the degree of stringency. George the Third, upon the throne of England, might well afford to treat the attempt at rebellion with compassionate lenience, as Scott, in the story of Red Gauntlet, has imagined him to have done. The principle, the purpose, the natural results of the act he could afford to overlook, were just the same as those which it would have been worse than folly for his predecessor to have dealt with in like manner. It is obvious that offenses that are technically the same, differ immensely in their actual magnitude, and must receive appropriate treatment. Now, the Church has found herself, at different times, holding this different relation to offenders of the same sort, when strong in herself, when conscious of the firm ligatures that, in spite of internal dissensions, bound her in one communion, from the great rivers of the East to the Western ocean; when one belief triumphed the world over, in respect to the grand points of Church authority, the obligation of the Faith, the nature

and functions of the ministry, and numberless details involved in these ; and when an erring Bishop or Presbyter, on being freed from heretical sophistry, in regard to this or that doctrine, or convicted of his mistake or folly, in violating some law of discipline, found himself at once holding relations to the Church and the brethren, that needed no re-adjustment, for they had never in wish or intent been touched—when this was the state of Christendom, it was wise, as certainly was possible, to allow returning wanderers to exercise their ministry again. But what, compared with this, is the condition of things now ? Where is this substantial unity of Christendom ? Where is this oneness of idea, respecting the main features of the Gospel, of the Church system ? Few, indeed, remain of those bands that held the Church together. Instead of all alike feeling and owning their pressure, we have to search for them, and convince ourselves by reasoning that they exist. And what is there in a Churchman's moral and theological constitution, and in his ecclesiastical relations, that is not disturbed, when he abjures his allegiance to his Bishop to become an independent teacher, or forsakes the ancient faith and discipline of CHRIST, to join himself to the Roman schism, and fill his soul with its novelties ? In the one case, he gives up every idea of union with CHRIST through his Church ; he makes total shipwreck of his former self. In the latter, he retains, indeed, certain abstract ideas, but their concretion he finds altogether elsewhere. That which he had supposed to be their embodiment, he now believes to be nothing but a false, delusive mist from the bottomless pit, to be blown away forever. Shall we quote ancient canons in favor of the restoration of such an one, to be again a guide of the flock ? Mercy pleads, indeed, for his restoration from a condition of deadly peril to one of safety, and let this be granted with all due facility—of this let the Church entreat and warn him to avail himself. But must we not, in soberness and sadness, pronounce, that he has unfitted himself to exercise his ministry, in the present condition of the Church ? It is hardly possible that he should ever recover from so fearful a shock. Most likely he will return, as they have done, who, from the deadly heats and mists of Mexico, have brought back their shattered frames to do invalids' duty for the rest of their days. In rare cases, should it prove otherwise, we submit that the example of prostrate penitence, would be more profitable for the Church, as well as more wholesome for the individuals themselves, than any pattern of ministerial zeal they might ex-

hibit ; a zeal, which could not fail to suggest, that infidelity to the Church could not be so great an evil, if such faithful men once committed it, and afterwards were as useful and trusted as ever.

One of the earliest matters to occupy the Convention was one of the most urgent and important—the condition of the Church on the coast of the Pacific. It presented a painful contrast between spiritual barrenness and inanition, and the vigorous life, the bold advance towards the almost boundless future of wealth and power, which characterized communities founded there under circumstances singularly favorable for secular prosperity. The whole world has been astonished at the growth of the civilized population in these lately degraded, deserted, or savage regions. The not distant prospect of the greatness of the States that have already laid the foundations of a vast commercial and political influence, exceeds anything that the liveliest imagination could have pictured, before the reality presented itself. No time, no opportunity was lost, because men did not discern or care for so glorious a future. With unexampled promptness and energy they pressed towards it. And what was their opportunity, was the Church's also. There were elements in the movement that she could have worked to her own advantage. Had she then been roused she would have fairly established herself in California by this time. There were few who had not become sensible of this, or who did not feel that on the Convention of 1853 would rest the obligation, to act with energy that would somewhat make up for the delay. The necessity for action was of the simplest, as well as most pressing sort. There were but eight clergymen in California, and three in Oregon. More than half of the eight had better have been anywhere else than there. Death had lately taken away the energetic Pastor of the sole well-established Parish in all that country, and his youthful successor had but just begun to prove his competency to fill so important a post. The dry earth gapes not for water more than such destitution called for the mission of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, and every instrumentality of Grace, complete in form, and ample in number and variety. The Convention at the outset showed a will to act. There was but a single obstacle in the way, an application in form on the part of the few Clergy and Laity of California to be received, as a Diocese, into union with the Convention. Had this been granted, the matter would have passed out of the control of the Convention, so far as California was concerned, and it was far from evident that this was its natural, or rightful course. In this incertitude, the difficulty was practically resolved by

an important informality in the application from California, there being no direct evidence that the applicants fully and distinctly acceded to the Constitution of the Church in these United States. The urgency of the case did not allow that so great interests should be left dependent on conditions, nor could every future contingency be foreseen. The alternative before the Convention was simply action or inaction ; to put things in such a state that they could keep pace with the fast growing population and needs of the Pacific States, or to leave them, much as it found them. The appointment of Missionary Bishops for California and Oregon, which was the result at which the Convention happily arrived, left any Diocesan rights that may exist untouched, while it provided the Episcopal sanction and guidance under which new Dioceses may be regularly and effectively formed. It respected the rights of the Churchmen of California and Oregon to choose their own Bishops, while it sent such men to be over them in the meantime, that there is little doubt as to the choice, when the proper time arrives.

We confess our surprise that the discussion of the subject occupied time for anything else than the settlement of its details. It is happily disposed of, however, and we may, in particular, congratulate our Brethren in those distant regions. After earnest and full deliberation, in view of the Church's good alone, they have been put under the charge of chosen men, of whom the one destined for the greater and more distant scenes of labor, has approved himself an able and zealous workman in edifying the Church under not very dissimilar circumstances ; the other, appointed over the future seat of Empire in the Pacific, has made for himself a wide and honorable reputation, at the same time that he has been sedulously and successfully prosecuting the ordinary work of a Parish.

Not the least, if it be not the most important, measure of the Session, was the change in the Canons relating to Holy Orders. The law of the Church, as it stands now, is, in part, as follows :—

I. Every person desiring to become a candidate for Holy Orders has simply to present the testimonials as to character, &c., heretofore required. He is no longer required to present a Diploma from some College or University, or in lieu of it, a certificate of examination in certain studies.

II. After remaining one year a candidate he may be ordained, provided he can produce testimonials from one Rector of a Parish and from the Wardens and Vestrymen of the Parish

to which he belongs, signifying their belief that he is well qualified to minister as a Deacon, and provided, also, that he can satisfy his Bishop and two Presbyters, that he is well acquainted with the Holy Scriptures and the Book of Common Prayer, and is fit for the ministrations declared in the Ordinal to appertain to the office of a Deacon.

So far, the new Canons are clear;* and “every person desiring to become a candidate for Holy Orders,” may pass through the above course. But hitherto every Deacon has been deemed a candidate for Priest’s Orders. The new Canons, however, evidently draw a distinction between candidates for Priest’s Orders, and Deacons ordained in the manner above described. They speak of a person’s becoming a candidate for Priest’s Orders, as if it were a distinct act, not necessarily implied in any that preceded it. They provide that the candidate in this case shall present his Diploma, or a Certificate of his examination in Greek and Latin, and in other branches of a college education, as required under the old Canons prior to candidateship for Deacon’s Orders. But they prescribe nothing as to the time or manner of becoming a candidate for the Priesthood. They enforce the former requirement of three examinations before the candidate is ordained Priest, and allow these examinations to be passed either before or after admission to the Diaconate, from which we infer that at any time after being ordained Deacon, the intention may be formed of going into the Priesthood. We infer also, that the Canons intend that there may be two classes of candidates for the Diaconate,—those who prepare for the simple duties of that Order, and those who are, at the same time, candidates for the Priesthood, and as such present their Diplomas or pass examinations, such as have heretofore been usual. It may seem strange that a person should be at once a candidate for both Orders, but the terms of the Canons certainly allow it. We cannot else understand an apparent contradiction between the terms of Canon V, of 1853, Section 1 and 2—and Section 7, of Canon VII. The former enacting that every person hereafter to be ordained Deacon, shall procure certain testimonials which shall *entitle* him to ordination at the end of one year, and the latter declaring that every candidate for Holy Orders shall remain a candidate for the term of three years. We can only reconcile these conflicting provisions by the supposition,

* So we thought when we wrote the above, but we find that there is room for the question whether ordination at the end of the one year, does not depend upon the consent of the Standing Committee. We refer the reader to a subsequent note.

that the framers of the Canons had in mind candidates for Holy Orders, who should pass their examinations, and remain their three years as heretofore, while others, at the end of one year, should be ordained solely with a view to the simple duties of the Diaconate.* It must be admitted, however, that the wording of the Canons is loose and contradictory. We will not venture to be positive, but it seems to us that as the Canons stand, four ways of reaching the Priesthood are appointed.

1. By being ordained Deacon at the end of one year, and subsequently preparing for the Priesthood.

2. By being ordained Deacon at the end of one year, but with previous passage of all the examinations, which "may take place" previously, so that, as soon after one year in the Diaconate, as the Deacon becomes twenty-four years of age, he may request and receive ordination to the Priesthood, without further examination. Thus, in two years time, without any dispensation from the Bishop, he may become a Priest. The only doubt we have here is, that as Canon XVII, of 1832, was not repealed by the Canon with a similar title lately passed, so that we have now two Canons "of preparatory exercises of a candidate for Priest's Orders," it may be that, under this double action, a Bishop may pass a candidate through the examining mill twice—or rather four times, thrice under the one Canon, and once under the other—for the same ordination, which is worse than being tried twice for the same offense.

* In a previous note, we have referred to another mode of treating this difficulty. As Canon VII declares that every candidate shall remain such for three years, unless the Bishop, with the consent of the Standing Committee, shall dispense with a portion of the term, it is thought by some, that this consent is to be added to the conditions imposed upon the candidate in Section 2 of Canon V. It is certainly possible to put this force, as we must phrase it, upon the Canon. But it seems to us an unnatural construction for these reasons:

1. We do not see how the candidate can be said to be "entitled" to his examination after remaining a candidate one year and on presentation of certain testimonials to his Bishop, if the Bishop before he can examine, must get the consent of the Standing Committee. It seems to us that nothing can justly stand between a man, and a thing he is entitled to. The Canon must be interpreted in accordance with this plain rule.

2. Canon V, certainly enacts the Church's general law "of the ordination of Deacons." Unless it makes exceptions itself, all the cases it provides for are general cases. But the provision in Section 7, of Canon VII, relates to an exceptional and discretionary case, and cannot fairly be converted into part of the general system laid down in Canon V.

We confess that as the Canons stand, they suggest the idea that, in accommodating the old Canons to the new system, Section 7 was overlooked; but as such an oversight seems hardly possible, we have chosen the alternative presented in the text.

3. If a person at the commencement of candidateship for the Diaconate, declares his intention of entering the Priesthood, the Canons seem to imply that he becomes a candidate for that Order also—in which case he presents his diploma, or stands the corresponding examination, remains a candidate for three years, is ordained Deacon, passing his Priest's examination or not, as he chooses, and if not, at the close of the term, is examined, and then advanced to the higher order. In this case, his course is the same as at present, except that before admission to the Diaconate, he must be examined specially, in the Holy Scriptures and Prayer Book, and in his fitness for the duties described in the Ordinal.

And lastly, the way to the Priesthood by special dispensation, remains unaltered in the terms of the Canons, and is unaffected by them. It is neither easier nor more stringent than before.

Indeed, in one respect we have heard apprehension expressed, for which there is no foundation. There is no fear that unlearned men will, by means of these Canons, find easy access to the Priesthood. Four examinations, if not five, confront the candidate for that high office ; one under section 3 of Canon VII ; three under Canon VIII, and a fifth, in presence of his Bishop, according to Canon XVII, of 1832.

Nor do the Canons open a door for unlearned, if by that is meant *uneducated*, men, into the Diaconate. It is true, that by a strange oversight, in transferring the requisition of a diploma, or certificate of examination, from its place, preparatory to candidateship for the Diaconate, to candidateship for the Priesthood, the vacancy thereby created was left unfilled, and candidates for Holy Orders may now become such on the mere presentation of testimonials as to character. The omission may be remedied, however, in two ways ; either, testimonials may be refused to an illiterate man, as not possessing such qualifications as render him "apt and meet" for the ministry, or, the Bishop may refuse, as he has power, to admit him among the candidates. At all events, such a person could never be ordained, for only one who had what is termed a good English education, could satisfy his examiners that he was well acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, and the Book of Common Prayer, and was fitted for a Deacon's ministrations, as the Ordinal declares them.

The effect of these changes in the Canon, will go far towards restoring the Order of Deacons to its ancient position. It is a matter now of express canonical provision, that Deacons shall be ordained, with a view simply to their capacity

for that station, which is designated in the Ordinal. The practice which has prevailed of ordaining them to a responsibility and work beyond their office, is made by the express terms of the Canon, the exception, not the rule. "*Every* person hereafter to be ordained a Deacon in this Church," shall be examined only in his qualifications for a Deacon's work. It is optional with him to pass his Priest's examinations, before or after his admission to the Diaconate. Any such person who desires to take charge of a parish, must in that case be examined, as if for the Priesthood. But Presbyters in charge of parishes can procure, under these Canons, the assistance of true Deacons. The Church has provided a sure way for the increase of the ministry. If there be not coldness, timidity, or weakness to avail ourselves of this enlarged instrumentality, if there be fidelity in those who are called upon to give testimonials, if there be firmness in the Right Rev. Bishops, to refuse Orders to those whom they judge not fit, and to rebuke examiners for negligent performance of their duty, if there be zeal in the members, and watchfulness in the Head—these new Canons will bear fruit beyond any the Church has yet harvested in our land. True, the measure will not work well, if ill administered, but that is not its fault. In spite of technical imperfections, which can and will be remedied hereafter, it will work well, if all wish it well, and speed it in their respective spheres, as in duty, we are all bound to do.

The measures, of which we have thus written at length, are the most important, in their immediate results, of the many that occupied the Convention. Many Canons and Resolutions, on other subjects, were passed, that will doubtless facilitate the working of the Church's system, and some of them will necessarily be productive of large results. The Index of the Journal will guide our readers to those, of which it would be impossible for us to say even a few of the many things they suggest, without largely exceeding our limits. There was one class of these measures, however, the future consequences of which can hardly be estimated too highly. We refer to the steps that were taken in respect to the Deputation from the Venerable Society for Propagating the Gospel.

The Convention did more than express its feelings of courtesy and kindness, towards welcome and respected guests. Such feelings were, indeed, uppermost in almost every mind; and showed themselves conspicuously on every occasion, public and private. The Resolutions that were passed, both on the arrival and departure of our visitors, with other acts

of attention, were in form acts of courtesy, but in substance, they were steps towards the freer intercommunion of the Churches. They were signs of the drawing together, in active fellowship, of brethren of the same household—not the mere formal interchange of civilities between members of separate and independent bodies. The true nature of all these proceedings is indicated by the appointment of a Joint Committee, under a Resolution to take measures for promoting the friendly and Catholic relations between the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. The result to which all this tends, was declared in the Resolution, as first proposed, to be the joint conciliar action of the two Churches. This expression was subsequently dropped; but, as one who opposed it perceived, without substantially changing it. The Committee were left free to move towards this end; and, indeed, towards what other end can they move? How are the Catholic relations between the two Churches to be increased, except by bringing them to feel and act as one, in those matters of chief concern to them as Churches, in regard to which they can have no separate interests? We cannot believe that any Churchman would intelligently object to such an issue, of all others, in the external history of the Church, the most desirable for her influence throughout the world, against Heathenism, and corruptions of the Gospel, and every form of evil. The direct proposal of joint action may be premature. England could not accede to it, were we to make it. The omission of such a proposal by the late Convention has no force beyond this, nor do we believe that more was intended by those who called for its omission. They were not prepared, nor was the time ripe, for such a declaration. We cannot understand them, however, as ready to put up a "partition wall" forever between portions of the Church of CHRIST, whose natural condition is that of most perfect fellowship, and when Providence calls to active union, for the sake of urgent work, that cannot be done if they keep asunder.

The signs of the times, in respect to the Reformed Church in England, America, and the world over, are unmistakable. Compassing the globe with one speech and one Liturgy—daily assimilating its diversities of system—ripening the distant acquaintance of its several portions with each other, under the genial warmth of personal intercourse, into the love of brethren—standing alone in the world as the representatives of Primitive Christianity—proposing to Christendom the only terms of unity, on which the Catholic Church

ever was one in external communion, it is our mission to present the original, pure, and perfect Gospel to Heathendom, and to the decayed Churches of the East, in the face of Papal and sectarian perversions. For this object, the reformed portions of the Church must inevitably be one, in every efficient mode, and by every substantial token of unity, that the world may believe that God has indeed sent them. They cannot promote this needful unity, if they perpetuate State jealousies. Their writers will not be heeded, nor their power, as one Communion, felt, if they cherish local or provincial peculiarities, as distinctive features of their Church life. That life must be shown by the concordant action of members under the guidance of one will, and that will can only speak by the voice of the Church in Council. We already see the dawn of the day that is to bring about the concourse of the Bishops and representatives of the Reformed Church, from the four quarters of the earth. Though our pulse beats strong and quick at this anticipation, we need not distrust the estimate we form of the importance of such an assemblage; and we are confident to assert, that a turning of the heart towards this object, and a readiness to work for it, will be one of the surest tests that the times now coming will afford of Churchmanship.

It was expected, and by many anxiously desired, that the General Convention would perfect certain measures of importance, which were left untouched, or deferred for another three years. The Judicial System of the Church, that in the present state is felt to be seriously defective, after much debating, could only be put in the way to a settlement at a future day. The formation of the Dioceses into Provinces, though a matter that bears very closely upon the Church's efficacy, and one that Time will inevitably bring about, was barely touched. The Convention failed also to accomplish anything towards increasing the number of Dioceses, by facilitating the division of those already formed. The measure, which was ripe for action, was negatived by the Bishops, and a new one proposed, which must run its long course towards maturity, to be then subjected to a like risk of failure. A movement, that originated in 1850, towards enlisting, under due regulations, the laity of both sexes in the charitable works of the Church, came to nothing. Much as the want of action, in these respects, is to be regretted, we must remember that it is impossible for all matters to proceed promptly and satisfactorily, through a body constituted as the General Con-

vention is, and in view of what was accomplished, gather hope and patience for the future.

We are ourselves disposed to be cheered by a circumstance that has caused alarm in some quarters. A Memorial was presented to the Right Rev. Bishops, and appears in the Journal, which was signed by several well-known Presbyters, representing very different schools of Theology. Simply looking at the signatures, and observing that they are the names of men who may be, at least, supposed to know what they are about, it seems a peculiarly happy circumstance, that a document could be prepared to draw such men together. One would infer that there are strong affinities among Churchmen, even of diverse opinions, that only need an opportunity to be active; the more active, surely the better for themselves and for the Church. Nor, on examining the Memorial, are we at a loss to understand its singularly attractive power. It shows a strong sense that, *in fact*, the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States does not *manifest* herself equal to the wants of every class of minds, and capable of meeting every exigency of society—*i. e.*, as we should put it, she does not actually come forward and fill the place of a Church, claiming to be Catholic; she lets herself appear too much as a sect. The Memorial further assumes, that any such deficiency is but accidental, and may be remedied by the Church herself; that she has within herself a capacity of adaptation to her work, however it may be presented. It expresses, also, a deep consciousness of the evil of the divisions that prevail among Protestant Christians, an earnest wish that something may be done to remedy it, a lively sympathy for those who are separated from each other, through want of mutual knowledge, and a generous readiness to let those feelings be known to all classes of our fellow Christians. In making certain specific suggestions, it subordinates those entirely to the preservation of the Faith. It concludes with a prayer that the whole subject may be referred to a Commission of Bishops, to inquire whether anything, and what, can be done in relation to it. Such is the general scope of this important paper, which commends itself to all Churchmen, who are alive to the evils of the day. Many such persons might sign such a paper for its general scope and spirit, and in view of the results which the Commission prayed for could hardly fail to bring forth, in the shape of well-digested information and valuable suggestions. They might sign it, without at all committing themselves to its specific suggestions, in entire willingness to trust

the matter to our Reverend Fathers. Two such suggestions are prominent in the Memorial; one looking to the ordination of persons who should not be bound precisely to be ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the other to a pretty large license in the mode of conducting public worship. Some of the signatures are subscribed to a qualified endorsement of the Memorial, in which exception is clearly taken to these suggestions. But, for reasons mentioned above, we do not suppose that the signers of the Memorial itself, necessarily endorsed these special measures.

Such is the fair account to be given of this document, and such the just estimate to be formed of the signatures attached to it. We believe that some of those who saw it in manuscript, treated it as if its whole force was concentrated in one or two obnoxious propositions, which is manifestly not the case. Its distinct and main object is to solicit earnestly that the Bishops would take into consideration the state of Protestant Christians in this country, the Church's relations thereto, whether anything can be done to bring about union in the ancient Faith, and in general, to devise means to increase the Church's efficiency. Out of twenty-four Bishops who voted upon it, four only, the Bishops of Virginia, Western New York, Massachusetts, and Arkansas were against the prayer of the memorialists. The Bishop of New Jersey was known to have declared that he would have voted in the negative, had he been present.

We repeat, then, that the favorable reception of the Memorial was a very encouraging sign. Without counting on the particular steps which the Right Rev. Commissioners may take, it is no slight thing to have obtained this profession of sympathy, before the world, towards members of those religious bodies, whom we believe to have no just cause of separation from us, but from whom we have stood as *coldly* apart as if they saw the matter from our point of view. "Your Episcopal Clergy," was lately the remark of a dissenting minister who spoke for more than himself, "are so wrapped up in their robes, that we cannot approach them on this subject." It is too true. Our clergy are not free enough to make advances, and the Church itself has been pervaded by a spirit of *hauteur* and reserve. The Journal before us bears testimony to the existence and activity of another spirit, and we trust, that ere long, our separated fellow Christians throughout the land may be stirred by the news, that our Bishops are sitting in formal consultation on the promotion of unity among Protestants—that the Church, by deeds as well as words, is

calling God to witness, how greatly she longs after all those, who are not yet partakers in her blessings.

The matters which we have thus handled, are those by which, we believe, the General Convention of 1853 will make its mark. We have not space left us to comment on other topics. We shall but say of the Pastoral Letter which our Right Rev. Fathers have put forth, that it may be taken in assurance that the course adopted in 1850, is not henceforth to become the rule. The Church is not to be told, that her Bishops cannot agree upon any words of instruction or encouragement. The Letter on this occasion, though of necessity short in some respects of what many could have desired it to be, contains counsels wisely adapted to our times, and cannot fail to promote good-will and moderation among us.

The acts of the Board of Missions stand in such close relation to the proceedings of the General Convention, that we cannot conclude our review of the late Session without a reference to the meetings of the Board. Were we to do justice to the chief feature in their proceedings, we should have much to say. It would be a new and tempting subject indeed, to treat of the mutual consultations of a joint Committee of our Board, and of the Venerable Society of our mother Church. That fact alone has a value far beyond any estimate which the public put upon it, and irrespective of the special results to which the Conference arrived. It has brought the two Churches, through their great Missionary Societies, to view their common duty. It has enlarged our own views, and enriched us with the experience of our brethren, who have been so much longer in the field than we. It has been the means of spreading through England a knowledge of our Church and her proceedings. It has taken the first step towards the adjustment of the mutual labors of the two Churches. It has begun to create an influence which, we believe, will grow in power, until Christendom and heathendom together, will rejoice to look back upon the day, when the Anglican and Anglo-American Communions, first treated their missionary work in common.

The proceedings of the Board generally, were not such as to call for notice here. We may, therefore, conclude this protracted Article with the additional remark, that though the action we have reviewed is far short of the necessities and opportunities of the times, yet the Church will hereafter find many reasons to recur to the General Convention of 1853, as a greater epoch than any other in her history, since Bishops Seabury, White, and Provoost, landed on our shores.

ART. VI.—HISTORY OF THE ANGLO-AMERICAN CHURCH.

The Frontier Missionary : being Vol. II of the Collections of the Protestant Episcopal Historical Society. By the Rev. W. S. BARTLET. Stanford & Swords, 1853.

THE Historical Society of our Church was instituted at a meeting of Bishops, Clergy, and Laity, held at Trinity College, Hartford, in June, 1850. It has, up to this time, published two volumes, the title of the last of which, we have placed at the head of this Article. Both volumes have contained matters of great interest and value ; but this last has about it, almost the charm of a romance. The Bishop of Maine thus speaks of it, in his Preface : “ There must be many who will find an attraction in these simple glimpses of New England life, as it was a century ago ; these college associations of a Harvard student, whose poverty placed him at the foot of a class which had a Wentworth at its head, and John Adams amongst its members ; this experience of the schoolmaster, who exchanges his Puritan home for the rude interior of a man of war, and thence emerges into all the bustle of London, to talk with Franklin, and review the speechless blessing of the dying Sherlock ; these walks of the lonely missionary through the woods, and these journeys by water, short, but toilsome, in his pastoral vocation ; these patient ministrations amongst his humble flock, interspersed with the recreations of a favorite garden and an ever ready pen ; these overshadowing skirts of the national tempest, reaching even to him, while the expedition of Benedict Arnold, on its slow way towards Quebec, through the wilderness, thins his little congregation as it passes by ; these trials of the exiles who, honestly hostile to change, and knowing not how to be silent, leave their home to be overgrown with weeds, and their house of prayer to fall to the ground, and still, after years of separation, cannot but cast a lingering look behind.” All this is said as truly as it is beautifully ; and Mr. Bartlet deserves our thanks for the volume he has written for us.

But we purpose, instead of giving an account of a work to which all Churchmen ought to entitle themselves by purchase, to say something in a general way of our Ecclesiastical History, and to urge in a few words the claims of our too much neglected Historical Society.

It is a trite observation, that any real history has a philosophy ; and that any history which has a philosophy, is capable of a division, in and by which, that philosophy can be worked out and exhibited. To obtain, then, such a division, is the first step after acquiring the necessary facts, and by means of it to present principles is the next one.

In the History of our Anglo-American Church, the following division complies, if we mistake not, with the required conditions ; and furnishes a basis on which to work.

I. The whole period which precedes the war of our Revolution ; beginning differently in different States, but ending simultaneously in all, in the year 1775.

II. The period, conterminous with the struggle of the Revolution ; beginning in 1775, and ending with the Definitive Treaty of Peace with the mother country, in 1783.

III. The period conterminous with that of our National formation ; beginning in 1783 and ending in 1789 ; the year in which our National Constitution, and the Constitution of our Church, both went into operation.

IV. The period commencing with 1789, and continuing to our own time ; the period of our proper History as a National Church, the subdivisions of which however, living as we are in the midst of its advance, we cannot now make, and must leave to be reviewed and settled, by those who shall come after us. It is of the first three of these divisions that we purpose to treat.

In the beginning, however, we must call attention to a remarkable fact, in connection with this division of periods. It will be observed that these periods entirely synchronize with those into which providential dispensations have thrown our civil history. We do not mean that a mere arbitrary arrangement of our civil history, may bring about this synchronism. It is always easy to accomplish anything like this. But when we speak of providential dispensations, we believe that all idea of arbitrary division is thereby shut out. While no attentive reader of our civil history can question that the great Ruler of nations has, by the Dispensation of His wise providence, wrought out in the progress of our national existence, very clearly laid out, its great divisions ; and thereby enabled us to attain to that truly philosophical view of our history, which grounds itself on the clearly developed progress of the national life ; while that national life does doubtless in the main, work out the divine will.

Now, it is easy to see, from the most cursory view of our civil history, that whatever other divisions there may be made

in it, these points of time, are especially marked, and occupy a peculiar prominence. These points are, the commencement of the War of the Revolution in 1775; the Definitive Treaty of Peace in 1783; and the adoption of the Federal Constitution in 1789. In 1775, the colonial period of our civil history came to an end; in 1783, the period of national formation commenced, which, in 1789, also came to an end; while, at the same time, the nation commenced its own career, under the new Constitution, and as a sovereign power. The synchronism, therefore, of the great epochs of our civil history, and the history of our Church, is obvious and striking.

But, it may be asked, let it be granted that this synchronism exists, and what does it amount to? It may be interesting, curious, striking, but is it, or can it be anything more? We have certainly no wish to be regarded as fanciful, or as placing any weight upon imaginary analogies, or coincidences. But coincidences of this kind, are not imaginary. They are real. They are matters of history; and therefore the orderings of Providence. They mean something. They point towards something. Look over all history, and it is simply full of them. And wherever we find them, they mean something.

When, therefore, we find the remarkable coincidence which we have just been setting forth, we are surely warranted in believing that it indicates more than a mere chance connexion between the history of our Church, and the history of the nation. When periods of dependence, of struggle, of reconstruction, and of independent existence—using this latter phrase in reference to our Church, with a remembrance that no branch can be independent of the Catholic Church of Christ—when periods like these coincide, as they do in our National and Ecclesiastical History, it cannot be fanciful to imagine, that there are probably in the designs of Providence, reciprocal relations between these histories of vast importance: in a word, that the Church whose history presents these coincidences, has a work to do for the nation, which no other religious body can have allotted to it. It may prove unfaithful, indeed, to its trust, but still we may believe, that the trust has been committed to it.

But leaving these preliminary observations, let us proceed to some general views—opening, as we hope, somewhat of the philosophy of our Church History, of the first or *ante-revolutionary* period.

And here we must say in the outset, that what come under consideration, will of course, be matters connected with the *external fortunes* of the Church, and not with the *internal*

progress of the divine life in human souls. Undoubtedly the former is altogether subservient to the latter: without the latter, there could be nothing of interest or of worth, to the former. Still it is not the latter, which in such an enquiry as we are now prosecuting, can come before us.

One of the first facts which strikes us, in turning to the Colonial History of our Church, is the relation, which it sustained to the Episcopacy. The fact is, of course, familiar to us all, that nominally—and it certainly was no more than nominally—the Church in the Thirteen Colonies was under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. In its immediate bearings and results, this fact has been often considered, and is, we doubt not, entirely appreciated. But there are some other consequences, which resulted from it, the influence of which on our after History was most important, which do not appear to have received their due share of attention.

There was a great difference in the way in which this relation worked itself out, between some of the colonies, and others. Thus in Virginia and Maryland, the commissarial system prevailed, and stood connected with parochial endowments, provided under the direct action of the civil government. In New York, on the contrary, and in the Eastern States, no commissarial authority was ever exercised; while in the latter especially, the support of the Clergy was derived entirely from voluntary offerings, and the benefactions of the Venerable Society in the Mother Church.

Now there are a number of points in connection with these differences, which are well worthy of attention.

In the first place, the commissarial system—though, perhaps, at first sight we should conclude the very opposite—had a tendency to give an appearance of unreality to the Episcopate, which it did not wear in those places where there were no commissaries, and no especial endowments. And this was in exact accordance with that general law, which runs through everything. For wherever an office has been especially appointed by Divine Providence, for the discharge of certain duties; if it delegates portions of its duties to others, and suffers its remaining duties to go undone, then it always itself falls into disrepute; and men come to think of it, at least lightly, and in all probability meanly. And this was just the way in which the commissarial system worked towards the Episcopal office. It made it unreal. It brought it into disesteem. And when we say this, we do not mean, in the slightest degree, to detract from the personal excellence of the men who bore it. When we mention the names of

Blair and Bray, every one who is in the least familiar with the history of our Church, knows that there are no better, no holier, no more illustrious names, in all its records, early or late. Still the fact remains; and it goes far to explain the different views entertained in different portions of the country, on the subject of the Episcopacy; views which exercised so important an influence later on.

Another thing, and one which is very much overlooked, tended towards the same result. This was partly a consequence of the commissarial system, and partly of the system of endowment. In the colonies where these things prevailed, the Clergy came chiefly from the mother country. The parishes were thus supplied, with comparatively little agency of their own. And in this way, the Episcopacy became unreal to them, in one of its very highest functions, that namely of Ordination. Elsewhere, however, this was by no means so. When the Clergy were supported by the voluntary offerings of their parishioners, and the contributions of the Venerable Society, then, as a general rule, and in some dioceses, it was the case without exception, those Clergy were the sons of the soil; and their connection with the Episcopacy was not only immediate and direct, but it involved also personal labors, trials, and perils of no ordinary magnitude. When Orders could only be obtained by an expensive and dangerous voyage across the Atlantic, there was a reality about them, which, under other circumstances, they could scarcely have. The self-denials which were necessary to procure the means for the journey, and the personal risks arising from the dangers of the sea, the violence of enemies and pestilence, were real and impressive; and they wrought not merely on the minds of the Clergy more immediately concerned in them, but on those also of the people. Of the first three persons, who went from the Diocese of Connecticut to the mother country, for Holy Orders, two returned. And it is believed, that the proportion of loss of life did not materially change in succeeding years. It is little thought of now; but the foundations of our Church in America, were not cemented, without tears and blood.

We speak of these things of course, as mere matters of fact, without any other than an historical reference; but they are, we believe, at least in part, the historical explanation of two lines of view, in reference to the Episcopacy, which once prevailed among us, and to some extent perhaps prevail still. At all events, they are facts, without the remembrance of which, our history cannot be understood or appreciated.

If now from the relations of the Episcopacy, we pass to those of the Parochial Clergy, in connection with the Laity, we shall find, that our ante-revolutionary period began to develop, in a very strong and striking way, the principle of lay-representation, and of the rights as well as the duties of the Laity, in the legislation of the Church. And this we humbly conceive to be one of the two great problems, which God has given our branch of the Reformed Church to work out ; or rather, we might say, one of those primitive truths which He has given to her to restore. We do not mean that anything formal, adjusted, and arranged was done. Where things begin in that way, they always die out, and end in nothing. There is but one exception to this law, found in the mechanical arts. And the reason why they are an exception, is, that then, there is only dead matter to deal with, uninfluenced by intellect, or will, or affection. But wherever man is concerned, great frame-works of great schemes, however well adjusted beforehand, always fail. The real, the true, the lasting, begins in small ways, and works on to great results.

And so it was here. We have already spoken of the unreality in one respect, attendant on the commissarial system. But there are others quite as great. In fact, it was all unreality ; and its unreality has been most forcibly depicted by the historian of two—would we could say more—of our now vast Confederation of Dioceses. Demosthenes once said, “that it was no great trouble to make a law ; the difficulty was to get the law willed.” Now in order to this *willing*, without which a law is even less than a dead letter, there must be, in all legislation, the consent of all on whom the law is to bear. Only one Lawgiver, and that one Almighty God, can enact laws without reference to this fundamental principle. Elsewhere, in all other legislative, ecclesiastical, as well as civil, there must be, to use in brief, an expression of the great Hooker’s, the consent of all Orders.

This principle was recognized with a good degree of distinctness, in the Anglican Reformation. But it was very imperfectly worked out in the mother country, on account of State relations, which hindered its free developments ; and it was reserved for our branch of the Church, to restore it, in its completeness, and to give it vitality and force.

Now herein lay one great unreality of the commissarial system. It did not directly or sufficiently provide for this consent. While in other places, although of course nothing was done or attempted in the way of formal legislation, yet, there was of necessity, a vast deal of real action, the neces-

sary preliminary to, and foundation of any legislation. In this way, then, the great principle under consideration, began to work out in our ante-revolutionary period.

We will illustrate this by an instance. When the general parochial system of the mother country came to put itself into form, under conditions so entirely different from those under which it had hitherto existed, it of course underwent correspondent modifications. In many instances, for long periods together, the management of its affairs was left entirely in the hands of the Laity; and while, no doubt, in some respects, evil resulted from this, still, in others, incalculable good grew out of it. In cases, moreover, where there was a Clergyman, the entire absence of old routine and established precedents in parochial details, threw him more upon advice and counsel. And then, where there was no commissary, and where his Clerical brethren were distant from him, and this was ordinarily the case, since it would have been the climax of absurdity to undertake to consult the Bishop of London, he was compelled to seek counsel from the faithful Laity. So that in this way, our Laity, especially outside the limits of commissarial jurisdiction, were, from the very beginning, trained to take an active and efficient part in counsels, which supplied the place of legislation. The value of all this, to us, can hardly be overestimated.

The two great points, then, which our ante-revolutionary period fairly developed, so far as the external advance of the Church—closely connected, indeed; with the internal—was concerned, would seem to be, the true relations of the Episcopacy, and the true position of the Laity. Various matters, indeed, tended to interfere with and to check this development; still, on the whole, it advanced, and in the main pervaded the Church.

On our second period, that of the struggle of the Revolution, we do not propose long to dwell. One principal point of view in which it is to be considered, both civilly and ecclesiastically, is, in its affording a gradual separation from the mother country, and a gradual training in self-dependence and action. It is only in this point of view that it will be now considered. Not that it has not other philosophical connections—even with our Ecclesiastical History; but that while this appears to be the most important one, it also most nearly concerns us at present.

One of the hardest lessons for bodies of men, as well as for individuals, to learn, is the lesson—using the words in a good sense—of self-dependence and self-action. It is not a lesson

which can be learned all at once ; it must be done gradually. Such is the law of nature.

Had, then, our infant Church been all at once left to herself, thrown on her own resources, when she had next to no resources—left to her own experience, when she had had next to no experience—what, humanly speaking, would have been the result ? What could it have been, unless a miraculous interposition had preserved her, but utter ruin ? But God does not work by miracles, when other means will do as well ; and the orderings of his wise Providence in this case, accomplished all that was required, in a manner which must excite our fervent gratitude, as well as our profound admiration.

In some measure, of course, this lesson was being taught our Church from the very beginning. Cheated by profligate ministers of those benefactions, which God had put it into the hearts of pious members of the mother Church to bestow on her—neglected by sovereigns, whose incapacity was only equaled by their profligacy—she would, with the exception of two or three colonies, have been left utterly alone, but for that Society whose name can never be mentioned by an American Churchman without a thrill of gratitude, the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. And we cannot but count it as of God's merciful and providential ordering, that the assistance thus derived, through so many years, from an extraneous source, came to our Church, in the vast majority of instances, not from the State in England, but from the Church of England ; represented for this purpose by a Society, voluntary and yet responsible ; a Society whose origin rests not with monarchs, or warriors, or statesmen, but with Bishops, and doctors, and scholars ; a Society which, while she reckons among her founders such men as Patrick, and Wake, and Gibson, and John Evelyn, and Robert Nelson, may well be indifferent as to whether or not there is connected with her establishment the poor and adventitious honor of a royal name. To such a source as this, then, God be thanked that so it was, are to be referred nearly all the extraneous aids, which, in her early years, the Church received.

Gradually trained, then, for self-dependence and self-action, it was by the sterner schooling of the Revolution that the Church was finally prepared for her great work. Two sorts of training are needed to make a real man ; a half-way man is made without any. There must be the kindly training of aid, and help, and encouragement. This forms one side of his character. But if he gets no more he is not a man. There must be the stern training of loss, and trial, and failing

hopes, and unsuccessful enterprises. And the same law holds of a Church or a Nation.

The Venerable Society gave our Church the former, and the struggle of the Revolution brought to her the latter. We do not design to enter into the question of individual adherence, during this struggle, to the one side or the other; to the king or to the country. At this distance of time, and seeing all that we see, we can be just to both parties then existing in our Church. We can remember, with pleasure, that our meek White was the Chaplain of the Congress, and that our bold Seabury felt that his oath of allegiance bound his conscience to the last. The personal question need not, and should not come into view. It is the ordering of God's Providence, whether wrought out by man's reverent aid, or against man's will, that we are to seek; and never, we say it boldly, never was a Church more clearly disciplined by that Providence for her future fortunes, than was ours. Trained up for self-dependence in that double school, in which alone a perfect training can be had, trained up in sunshine and in storm, by kindness and by hardness, she was made fit for her wondrous destiny; a destiny whose greatness we may well believe to be indicated by this very thing. O, what lofty ideas of God's purposes through us, what humble and abasing ones of what we have accomplished in carrying out these purposes, do thoughts like these suggest!

When this stern schooling had reached its end, then, in 1783, properly began the work of reconstruction for our Church, which closed with the General Convention of 1789; and to some general views, connected with this topic, we now pass.

What, precisely, had the Church to do? What elements had she to work with? And what great primitive principles, if any, in reference to external relations—for we are all along speaking of these—were wrought out?

The precise work of the Church, then—and it is certainly all-important that every student of our Ecclesiastical History should have clear views on this point—was just to adapt that organization, discipline, and worship, which she had received (for doctrine cannot here, for obvious reasons, be taken into view) to the country in which her lot was cast. A great deal of mystification and bewilderment, in these latter days, in connection with Ecclesiastical History, has grown out of forgetting the difference between *development* and *adaptation*. And so, on the one hand, men have gone wild in ungoverned fancies, because they have forgotten, that while they might

adapt God's Institutions to men's wants, they were not to develop them into strange and unnatural growths ; and, on the other, they have sunk down into a most stupid and dead conservatism—which, by the way, is no true conservatism, because, while they have justly feared to tamper with God's Institutions, they have forgotten, that those Institutions could be adapted to men's varying wants, without interfering with their essential organisms. So, a man may be continually called upon to use his limbs in various ways, to assume various postures, to bring different muscles into play ; while he would never dream of interfering with, or changing his physical organization ; of lopping off an arm, or ear, or foot, upon the one hand ; or trying to make himself a Briareus, or a centipede, upon the other.

The Church's work, then, was to adapt what, through the mother Church she had received from ancient days, to the necessities of a new country, with all its manifold requirements. And it has been her work ever since. It is her work now. It is impossible to have this too constantly in mind, or too practically present with us. That a certain arrangement of fundamentals had prevailed in the mother country, was no proof after our Revolution, that it was the best arrangement for our country, *those fundamentals being safe* ; nor is it any proof that a given adaptation for us is best now, that it was best for us then ; for no country in the world has ever undergone changes like our own. And there was no danger after our Revolution, in acting on this principle of adaptation, provided only it was remembered, that divine organizations and Institutions were not to be changed. May we not be allowed to add, there is no danger in acting on it now ?

But in undertaking this great work, what had the Church to work with ? She had every thing of course, which she had inherited from the Apostolic ages by transmission through the mother Church. All that goes to make up what we mean when we use the word Polity : an organization, a Creed, a worship, a discipline ; all to be preserved intact, but all, as we have said, (save only the Creed, which as being God's truth does not change even in form, except as now one part, or then another, is brought more prominently into view, by prevailing errors,) all to be adapted to the new region whither, traveling westward ever, the Church had come. While, as we have seen in glancing at an earlier period, she had some specific qualifications, and helps, to fit her for her work. She had learned self-dependence ; she had learned moderation ; she had learned humility, a lesson very easily forgotten ; she had

been trained among the people of the land ; she was no stranger in it ; she spake not in a foreign tongue, but she came uttering a language dear as it was noble, cherished as it was glorious. And she had been enabled to come up to the revival of a great primitive practice. So that as Cyprian ordered all things done, "omni adstante plebe," she did everything with the consent and the aid of her faithful people.

Now, in doing a great work like this, it would be simply absurd to suppose that everything was done in the very best manner. But we envy not the man, who, where the whole was so good, so truly glorious, so manifestly under the ordering of God's Providence, can stop to pick little flaws, and grope amidst minute details. It is right, it is the part of true love as well as of true humility, not to claim for any work where men are agents, that attribute which belongs only to the works of God. Let us not claim it here. But neither on the other hand let us forget, that there are such manifest tokens of divine protection, as should make us think and speak, warily and with reverence ; lest we be rather displaying our own conceit or ignorance, than doing anything better.

And now, what great primitive truths, or practices, were brought out again, and reestablished in this process. For if the work were real, this were very likely to occur. One of these has been already noticed in some degree, and the other must now be added, to make up the enumeration. The first is, the true position of the Laity ; and the second is, the true relation of the Church to the State.

It is certainly a noticeable thing in the history of the Anglican Church in its various branches, that God has enabled it to do, what if we were engaged with merely human things might well be called, working out the problem of this relation. In the various branches of that Church, the Laity have occupied all possible positions, and the Church also has occupied all possible relations to the State.

In the mother country, as we know, the principle of lay action in ecclesiastical legislation, developed itself jointly in the sovereign and the parliament. But this seems at best a roundabout way of attaining the result. And the practical issue has been to silence alike the Clergy and the Laity ; except in so far as the latter may be considered to be represented by an assemblage, not one member of which must of necessity be a member of the Church of England.

Fortunately, the very circumstances of the case, rendered it impossible for the lay representation to assume any such form among us. It must be either direct, or nothing, and

while the exclusion of the Laity, which was the rule of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, found few advocates among us, the method of the Church of England was a simple impossibility, and therefore things fell naturally into the form which they then assumed, and in which they have continued ever since. We say that only a few among us advocated the system of the Scottish Episcopal Church. We might with truth say none. For we believe it to be an historical fact, that when Bishop Seabury, and those who thought with him, found that the admission of Laymen to our conventions, involved only *legislative*, and not *judicial* action, they withdrew their opposition, and acceded to the measure.

In the same manner have the branches of our Reformed Church been placed in all possible relations to the State, and herein as men would say, have they worked out an important problem. Protected and interfered with in England: persecuted and interfered with in Scotland: neither protected, persecuted, nor interfered with,—apart from the Puritan persecutions,—in America, and certainly never by the general government; these have been the positions in which the different branches of our Church have stood, in reference to this most important accident—if accident it is to be called—in the Church's History. They have tried them all, and while we are perfectly willing to refer the verdict as to which is the best, the truest, the most primitive position to other voices to proclaim, and other hands to write, so neither can we hesitate to pronounce in favor of our own.

These then, we believe to have been two great truths, wrested from oblivion, and preserved for the world, by the Church of which we are members. We do not mean to say, that these are all. When we look back to the English Reformation, to the days of Cranmer, and Latimer, and Ridley, and run down the glorious line of after history, we feel how many things there are, the best and noblest in all the world, which under God men owe to our Anglican Church. But it would seem that in reference to the external fortunes of the Church, these are the two great truths, which have been worked out among us, and which therefore are our special heritage. God grant that we may never lose them!

We have thus endeavored to throw together some thoughts and views which we hope may be of service at least to younger students of our Ecclesiastical History. We shall only add one word in conclusion, in reference to our Historical Society. If there is any truth in the views advanced, it is only because they are grounded in a careful induction of

facts ; and facts are not to be collected without research and labor. They are, moreover, unhappily, every year becoming more scanty, as those in whose memories they were stored, are passing away ; as the perishable materials where they are preserved are destroyed ; as all the monuments of the past, of what kind soever, are coming to nought.

We are getting to be a sadly unhistorical people. The sites of our old battle-fields are forgotten in the teeming labors of the husbandman ; our ancient fortifications are dilapidated, and plundered for domestic wants ; the graves of our heroes and fathers are swept remorselessly away, to make room for the railway, the street, or the mart. There is reason to fear that we are also becoming an unhistorical Church. It is a bad sign, if we are. It will be an evil thing, if we do. But if we are not to do so, then the memories of our past must be gathered up, before they all are gone ; the words of the fathers must be preserved, before they have passed away. We are almost too late, in even the small attempt that we have made in our Society, to prevent so sad an issue. Shall we allow that small attempt to come to nothing ? Let us be more faithful to the recollections of what has gone before, to the duties which are present with us, and the hopes to which we look forward. Now is the time to do a work of preservation, for which those who come after us will praise our names. Let it be done then, and be done well and heartily.

NOTE.—A DISPUTED FACT EXAMINED.

In the April Number of the *CHURCH REVIEW* of the present Volume, a writer, in describing the change now going on in the character of "New England Theology," asked, by way of illustration, the following question: "Has not a Unitarian minister been received into a Congregational pulpit in New Haven?" A contributor to the "New Englander," whom the printed list of authors affirms to be the Rev. LEONARD BACON, D. D., of New Haven, in the May Number of that Quarterly, replies to the interrogatory of our contributor as follows: He says, (capitals and all,) "We answer, NO." And, as if there might be, after all, some room for misapprehension, he adds, "the 'minister' referred to is not a Unitarian."

Now, whether the "minister referred to" is, or is not, a Unitarian, might, under ordinary circumstances, be a question not worth discussing in our pages. But, taken in connection with some other facts of a similar character, which seem to us somewhat significant, the question, whether a Unitarian minister has been admitted, and that, as we learn, by way of regular exchange, into the pulpit of one of the oldest Congregational Societies in New Haven, and whether the minister of another, and that the oldest and largest Congregational Society in New Haven, has volunteered to quiet public sentiment by a public denial, is, on several accounts, a good deal of a question; and one which Churchmen have something to do with. For instance, Churchmen are often reproached for their adherence to what are sneeringly called "*stereotyped Creeds*," and a "*petrified Liturgy*." Such a development, as we have alluded to, will not be very likely to diminish that attachment. Churchmen have been regarded as a set of uncharitable bigots, for not joining in all sorts of "Sabbath School Union Celebrations," &c., &c., and so exposing the lambs of the flock to all kinds of influences from all sorts of men. If it be bigotry, such facts as we have referred to, will not have a tendency to lessen *that kind* of bigotry. And Churchmen, in laboring for Church-extension, in New England, and throughout our country, usually have the credit of being governed by a mere spirit of narrow-minded proselytism. Such facts as we are discussing, will show that their zeal may, possibly, deserve another and a better name.

There is, then, an open issue between the "New Englander" and ourselves, as to a simple question of fact. It is a question, about which there can be, and ought to be, no concealment. We, certainly, shall use none. The "pulpit" referred to, is that of the "North Congregational Church" of New Haven, of which the Rev. S. W. S. Dutton is Pastor. The "Unitarian Minister" alluded to, is the Rev. F. D. Huntington, of Boston. The only question, therefore, is this: is the Rev. F. D. Huntington, of Boston, a Unitarian? We still affirm, without

hesitation, that he is; and we give the following reasons for supposing so:

1st. We have the explicit statement of a Congregational minister, of the highest standing, one who has every opportunity of knowing the facts, that Mr. Huntington is a Unitarian, and is, and always has been regarded as a Unitarian, in the region where he is best known.

2d. We have before us files of Unitarian publications reaching back several years, in which Mr. Huntington's name uniformly appears as that of a Unitarian Minister, and frequently as taking a leading part in Unitarian services, and as closely identified with the interests of that sect.

3d. In the last "Christian Examiner," the well-known and able organ of Unitarianism, there is a particular account of the "Autumnal Convention of Unitarians" (so it is called by themselves) lately appointed and held at Worcester, Mass. Here again, we find the Rev. F. D. Huntington; and what is more, appointed to preach the concluding Sermon at this "Unitarian Convention."

In all this, we suppose we have evidence enough to prove that the Rev. F. D. Huntington is a Unitarian. He certainly regards himself, and is regarded by them, as such. He enrolls himself among Unitarians. He identifies himself with Unitarians. He publicly endorses Unitarian sentiments. He is put forward by Unitarians on public occasions to advocate Unitarianism. We dare say the unqualified denial on the part of the "New Englander," is regarded by the Unitarians themselves as something decidedly "rich:" and we know perfectly well, and can show, if need be, in what light they look upon certain late movements in Connecticut.

4th. But we affirm Mr. Huntington to be a Unitarian, on the authority of the "New Englander" itself! In the last (November) Number of that Quarterly, we find the Editor quoting, eulogizing, and warmly endorsing, Mr. Huntington's late Sermon, before the Meadville *Unitarian* Seminary. It copies the following language; which, though carefully guarded, settles this whole question with every *well-read* theologian. "Stated in its theological relations, I hold this truth to stand thus. * * * If Christ were mere and *very* man, he could not mediate between God and man," &c. Now, that little word "VERY," is the *very* word which, as clear as daylight, shows what Mr. Huntington is. What may be the precise form of Mr. Huntington's unbelief; or whether it have any form; or, if it have, whether it is to-day what it was yesterday, or will be to-morrow, we neither know, nor care to know. That Mr. Huntington denies the true and "very" humanity of Christ, the "New Englander" itself is our witness.

The New Englander may, perhaps, reply, that Mr. Huntington *here* only denies the "very" humanity, and not the very divinity of Christ. But every scholar knows that this is just one of those points where Eutychianism, with all its subtleties, ancient and modern, has always been clearly marked and defined. No one who denies the "very" humanity of Christ, (and Mr. Huntington does deny it,) can hold, or ever did hold, the doctrine of the Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the

Godhead, as received by the Orthodox Church in all ages. We affirm confidently, that Mr. Huntington will not pretend he holds to that doctrine. Nor let it be forgotten, that whoever denies that central Doctrine of Christianity, the Doctrine of Three Persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and One God, as announced in the old Formulae of Orthodox Christendom, has denied the Faith. Nor is it to us, practically, at all important, what point in the descending scale of error such a man has already reached.

5th. We have other, and equally strong evidence, that Mr. Huntington is a Unitarian; but which, for the present, we prefer, for various reasons, to withhold.

We only add, in conclusion, that although it has become common with certain men at the present day to sneer at the doctrine of the Trinity, as a metaphysical speculation, yet the dividing line between Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy on that great question, has, for fifteen hundred years, been drawn so distinctly, that everybody, who chooses, can see where it lies. And it has proved itself, in the historical developments of Christianity, to be a good deal too broad for any man to stand on both sides of it at the same time. Among the Congregationalists of Massachusetts, more than a quarter of a century of sharp theological conflict on this very doctrine, and the lines which have been there drawn, do not render it possible for Mr. Huntington's position to be equivocal. It is an insult to the understanding of its readers, for the "New Englander" to pretend the contrary.

It must be distinctly understood, that in what we have already said, we do not complain because certain Congregationalists in Connecticut and Unitarians in Massachusetts, are breaking down the old partition wall between them. That is not our concern. What we do insist on, is, that the banner which waves upon their battlements shall, at least, bear an honest inscription.

The vast and increasing influence of New England Theology, as well as of New England Literature, generally, throughout our whole country, must be our only apology for this present discussion. It is by no means a local question.

ART. VII.—BOOK NOTICES.

HISTORY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH; with a General Introduction to Church History. By PHILIP SCHAFF, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburgh, Pa. Translated by EDWARD D. YEOMANS. New York: Charles Scribner, 1853. 8vo. pp. 684.

Few of our readers can be ignorant of the existence of a class of theologians in our country, having a distinct type of character; and yet possessing sufficient power of influence, intellectual and moral, to make themselves felt beyond their own limited boundaries. The head quarters of this influence, is at Mercersburgh, in Pennsylvania, and perhaps, the best known of their writers has been the Rev. Dr. Nevin, formerly editor of the Mercersburg Review. His productions, as well as those of the class whom he represented, have been distinguished by their sympathy with early Antiquity, their sturdy and uncompromising opposition to the Sect spirit, and to Sectism in all its forms, and also by their thorough and varied learning. Such, and so strong has been the impression made by these men, that some among ourselves have already anticipated their ultimate, if not speedy union with us on the basis of our Primitive Standards of Faith and Discipline. For ourselves, we have never shared in that anticipation, so far as the Rev. Dr. Nevin was concerned. For we detected, even in his earlier writings, theories, and habits of speculation, too decidedly of the German cast to admit of his being satisfied on any such basis. And his later writings have dispelled such expectations in the minds of all.

But another of the Mercersburg Professors, not, perhaps, less worthy of being known, is the author of this large volume of Church History. He, too, is connected with the "German Reformed Church" in the United States. He is thoroughly learned, and evidently possesses all those sympathies which we have before described. It is Professor Schaff's design to write a complete history of the Church, from the Primitive Age to the present time. He divides that history into three ages; and each age into three periods. His "First Age" extends from the Apostolic Church to the Established Church of the *Graco-Roman Empire*, and to Gregory the Great, A.D. 590. His "Second Age" reaches from Gregory the Great to the Reformation, (A. D. 590-1517.) His "Third Age" will cover "the Modern or Evangelical Church, in conflict with the Roman Catholic Church, from the Reformation to the present time." Each of these nine-subdivisions will probably occupy a volume. The present volume, therefore, covers the first period of the "First Age," or the strictly Apostolic Church, A.D. 30-100. In it, however, we have his General Introduction, his idea of the Church, his view of the true province of Church History, his strictures on Catholic, Roman Catholic, and Protestant Church Historians; and his treatment of collateral subjects, as the "Preparation for Christianity in the history of the world, and the moral and religious condition of Humanity, at the time of its appearance." All this occupies 190 pages, and illustrates the learning, the competency, and the spirit of the author.

To express our judgment of this volume, and to vindicate it by illustrations; to show what in our judgment is the position which Professor Schaff is to occupy in this country as a Church Historian, would require more space than we can here command. We shall hope, however, to return to the subject, ere long, and to do both it, and the author, more ample justice. We do not hesitate to say, that as a religious teacher he announces great truths, and verifies them, with a boldness which will command attention among the Protestant sects of the country. Here, for example, is one. "The prevailing tone of Protestant theology in America, is radically anti-Catholic, but on this very account fitted to call forth, sooner or later, a mighty reaction in favor of the opposite extreme" p. 134. Here is another example. "If now we consider, in fine, that in the second century the episcopal system existed, as a historical fact, in the whole Church, East and West, and was unresistingly acknowledged, nay, universally regarded as at least indirectly of divine

appointment; we can hardly escape the conclusion, that this form of government naturally grew out of the circumstances and events of the Church, at the end of the apostolic period, and could not have been so quickly and so generally introduced without the sanction, or at least acquiescence, of the surviving apostles, especially of John, who labored on the very threshold of the second century, and left behind him a number of venerable disciples" p. 541.

How far, and on what grounds, Professor Schaff is faulty on what we regard as fundamental Church principles, we shall not here consider. But we express the devout hope, that he may live to complete what, with so much preparation, he has begun; and that his labors may contribute to restore a *true and living unity*, to the now rent, and torn, yet blessed Body of our Lord.

PRINCIPLES OF GEOLOGY; or, the modern changes of the Earth and its Inhabitants considered as Illustrative of Geology. By Sir CHARLES LYELL, M. A., F. R. S., &c. A new and entirely revised edition. Illustrated with maps, plates, and wood-cuts. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1853. 8vo. pp. 834. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

This is the most elaborate and important work on Geology which has ever appeared in our language. A great defect in most compositions on the subject is, that they state positions, and verify them by assertions, but leave the reader in the dark as to the actual amount, and weight, of the evidence. In the present volume, we have that evidence clearly and fully presented. It should be said, however, that Sir Charles Lyell gives us in the work before us only a distinct department of the subject.

In former editions of the Principles of Geology, there was included what is now a separate and distinct work. The present edition contains only an account of the more modern changes which are supposed to have taken place in the earth and its inhabitants. In former editions there were included those changes which are supposed to have taken place at a more ancient date. Sir Charles Lyell recommends the "Principles" as the first to be studied, as preparatory to the more clear understanding of the "Manual of Elementary Geology," formerly included in the same volume, but now published separately. The work before us is a reprint of the latest revised edition by the author.

The volume is divided into three Books. The first Book, (thirteen chapters,) gives a "historical sketch of the progress of Geology, with a series of Essays, to show that the monuments of the ancient state of the Earth and its inhabitants, which this Science interprets, can only be understood by a previous acquaintance with terrestrial changes now in progress, both in the organic and inorganic worlds."

The second Book, (eighteen chapters,) describes the "observed changes in the *inorganic* world now in progress: first, the effects of *aqueous* causes, such as rivers, springs, glaciers, waves, tides, and currents; secondly, of *igneous* causes, or subterranean heat, as exhibited in the volcano and the earthquake."

The third Book, (seventeen chapters,) describes the "observed changes of the *organic* world now in progress; first, nature and geographical distribution of species, and theories respecting their creation and extinction; secondly, the influences of organic beings in modifying physical geography; thirdly, the Laws according to which they are imbedded in volcanic, fresh-water, and marine deposits."

As to the *theological* bearings of this work we cannot expect in this volume, so clear a presentation of the author's views, as in his other book, in which he discusses the subject of the *ancient* changes in the earth. We are glad to find him saying, that "in whatever directions we pursue our researches, whether in time or space, we discover everywhere the clear proofs of a Creative Intelligence, and of His foresight, wisdom, and power." In respect to the *time* of the creation of man, and the Scriptural Chronology, he yields more deference to the speculations of the Chevalier Bunsen, as to the Egyptian difficulties, than we could have wished. The Rev. Dr. JARVIS, in the Third Volume of the "Church Review," and a writer in our last Number, have, we think, proved, that as yet we have nothing to fear from such speculations.

It ought, in this connection, especially to be noticed, that Lamarck's theory of

transmutation, or development, by which he would make man to be only an improved *ourang-outang*, is most thoroughly exploded by Sir Charles Lyell, and by arguments which must be pronounced unanswerable. In contradiction also to Professor Agassiz, he says, "*there is no sound objection*" to the opinion, that the whole human family sprang from one pair. And yet he is loose enough in his conception of the very nature of Christianity, as the following extract from another late work of his shows: "It may be said that the spirit of progress, the belief in the future discovery of new truths, and the expansion of Christianity, which breathes through every passage of this memorable discourse, did not characterize the New England Independents any more than the members of other sects. Like the rest, they had embodied their interpretations of Sacred Scriptures in certain fixed and definite propositions, and were but little disposed to cherish the doctrine of the *gradual development of Christianity*. The Romanists had stopped short at the Council of Trent, when the decrees of a general council were canonized by the sanction of an infallible Pope. In like manner, almost every Protestant Church has acted as if religion ceased to be progressive at the precise moment of time, when their own articles of belief were drawn up after much dispute and difference of opinion."—(Second Visit to the United States, Vol. I, p. 211.)

His present contribution, however, was designed to have nothing to do with Biblical interpretation. It is a work on Physical Science; and we cannot too earnestly recommend this large and important volume, particularly to the Clergy of the Church. It is a subject which they must examine thoroughly, if they would be worthy of their vocation, and meet the demands, which modern science is making upon them. They cannot retain even the slightest hold which the clergy now have upon society, without being prepared to meet such questions as these intelligently and fearlessly. Nor can they justify their own indolence and stupidity, by complaining of the want of respect paid to the clergy. They must command that respect, as well by their general intelligence, as by their fidelity to the more immediate duties of their profession.

The volume before us is neatly printed, and contains numerous illustrative maps, plates and wood-cuts. We notice that the "Manual of Elementary Geology" has already appeared from the same press.

DISCUSSIONS ON PHILOSOPHY AND LITERATURE, EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITY REFORM.
Chiefly from the Edinburgh Review. Corrected, vindicated, enlarged in Notes and Appendices. By Sir WILLIAM HAMILTON, Bart. With an Introductory Essay, by ROBERT TURNBULL, D. D. Harper & Brothers, 1853. 8vo. pp. 764. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

The philosophical papers in this volume evince quite as much metaphysical acumen and power of searching analysis, as his other work noticed in our last Number. Besides these, this volume also contains his articles on the English Universities; which attracted so much attention on their appearance; and which had much to do in bringing up the question of University reform. These, with the Appendices, are written with great ability, and are an important part of the Educational literature of the day. His philosophical speculations we shall not now criticise. In arraying himself against the intense ideality, or *subjectivism*, of the Eclectic School, he has been charged with running into the opposite extreme of materialism; ending legitimately and inevitably in atheism. Men, who do not understand, or cannot appreciate the Scotch philosopher, can easily enough ring changes on that key. Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, those great Masters of German idealism, Hamilton subjects to an investigation which has disturbed the self-complacency of the Eclectic School very considerably; and they find it immensely easier to call hard names than to meet his positions.

CAUTIONS FOR THE TIMES. Addressed to the parishioners of a parish in England, by their former Rector, RICHARD WHATELY, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. In Three Parts. New York: Stanford & Swords, 1853.

We had heard of this work in its English form. The preface to the American edition says, "it was commenced in London in 1851, and is composed of twenty-

nine Tracts. The first eight, extending through 140 (8vo.) pages in the English edition, are upon *Romanism*; the succeeding ten, (160 pages,) are upon *Tractarianism*; and the remaining eleven, (174 pages,) are upon the reaction of Romanism and Tractarianism towards latitudinarianism, rationalism, antinomianism, and infidelity."

Few men in modern times write as cleverly as the Archbishop of Dublin; few men keep more constantly before the public; few have less influence in shaping public opinion. Twenty years ago he recalled a whole edition of a costly work, for having written a little too much.

These "Cautions" have all his merits and defects. His blows on Romanism, especially on the popular Romish arguments, fall like a sledge hammer. He also traces the tortuous, shuffling, dodging, evasions of the leaders of the "Tractarian" School, until he finally convicts them of being, what Newman says he himself was, for four years, at heart, a thorough Romanist. And yet, Archbishop Whately is as thoroughly unsound, though in another and opposite direction, as the men whom he so mercilessly lashes. Nor is he always historically accurate in doctrinal statements. He is too much of a professed logician to be a good reasoner on religious matters. He is worthy of being read; he is not always worthy of being trusted. To verify all that we have said by reference to his publications, we have not room. Whoever reads him carefully will see to what we refer, and that we have done him no injustice.

THE HOMES OF THE NEW WORLD; *Impressions of America*. By FREDERIKA BREMER. Translated by MARY HOWITT. 2 vols. Harpers, 1853. 12mo. pp. 651, 654. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Miss Bremer's reputation for cleverness, secured for her a kind reception from the American people as she landed on our shores; and her journey through the country was a quiet but almost uninterrupted ovation, an illustration of that hero-worship, for which the Americans have acquired an unenviable reputation. Of course, Miss Bremer on her return home has written a book—two closely printed volumes—in which, although she has spoken with a good deal of freedom of the persons whose hospitalities she shared, yet she has not stung her benefactors like Dickens; nor grossly misrepresented us as a people, like the Trollopes and Basil Halls.

As a picture of American society and manners, the work is nearly valueless. Besides its tedious sentimentalisms in place of vivid descriptions, she seems to have been exceedingly careless, or prodigiously imposed upon, or both. To say nothing of her Florida rattle-snake "three yards long," she describes Senator Seward as being from Boston; Dickinson as from Alabama; and Benton she speaks of as having grown up on the outskirts of civilization, and as going armed, *cap-a-pie*, with bowie knives and revolvers. But what is most amusing, she made the remarkable discovery, that the bones of Columbus are resting in the Cathedral at Havana! over whose monument she sentimentalizes in her usual vein!

But this is not the worst feature of the volumes. Miss Bremer is a reformer. Her religious belief, or unbelief, as it oozes out here and there, seems to be a sort of mongrel Swedenborgianism. Among the first and the last objects of her attention and interest in the country, were those "Phalansteries" as they are called, which are the resort of the Socialists; and she writes, while in Cuba, "I feel myself more ardent than ever for those social doctrines which are laboring to advance themselves in the free States of America." To what extent she pins her faith on Revelation, may be inferred from the following: "I cannot understand why each hemisphere should not be considered as the mother country of its own people. The same power of nature, the same creative power, are able to produce a human pair in more than one place." Vol. ii, p. 50. It is worthy of notice, also, that the persons to whom she was drawn by closest affinity, were such wild dreamers as Theodore Parker and Ralph W. Emerson. Of the former, she draws the following portrait:

"In the forenoon I went with them to Church, and heard a singular kind of Sermon from Theodore Parker, a man of powerful character, and richly gifted as a

speaker, who, with a strong and fearless spirit, applies the morality of Christianity to the political and social questions of the day and the country. He has a Socratic head, large, well formed hands, and his whole being, expression, gestures, struck me as purely original—the expression of a determined and powerful nature. * *

"On Sunday I again heard him preach. He made a full and free confession of his faith, and I was rejoiced to see his honesty and courage, although I could not rejoice at the confession of faith in itself, which was a very imperfect recognition of the Christian revelation, and which acknowledged in Christ merely a human and moral teacher, although as such the model and the ideal of humanity. Parker belongs to the Unitarian body; and to that section of it which denies miracles, and everything that requires supernatural agency in the sacred history. That which really displeased me was, that Parker asserted that he regarded Christ as standing in no other relationship to God than did all mankind; and that he merely was mentioned in history as 'a modest young man from Galilee.'

"In the evening I had a visit from Theodore Parker. I am so great a lover of courage in all forms, and of every unreserved expression of opinion and belief, that I extended my hand to him, thanking him cordially for his candor. But I nevertheless told him frankly my objections to his Christology, and we had a good deal of quiet controversy. I found Parker extremely agreeable to converse with, willing to listen, gentle, earnest, and cordial. I stated to him also my objections against the Unitarian point of view in general, because from it many of the greatest and most important questions as regards God, humanity, and life, must be left unsolved, and never can be solved. Parker heard me with much kindness and seriousness, and conceded various things—conceded, among others, the reasonableness of miracles, when regarded as produced by a power in nature, but not out of it—the law of nature on a larger scale.

"As I said before, Parker has a Socratic head; he has a pure and strongly moral mind; he is like Emerson, captivated by the moral ideal; and this he places before his hearers in words full of a strong vitality, and produces by them a higher love for truth and justice in the human breast. Parker, however, as a theologian, is not powerful; nor can he talk well upon the most sublime and most holy doctrines of revelation, because he does not understand them. In his outbursts against the petrified orthodoxy, and the petrified church, he is often happy and true. But I think that people may say of him as somebody said about a greater man, Luther, '*Il a bien critiqué mais pauvrement doctrine.*' Parker, however, investigates earnestly, and speaks out his thoughts honestly, and that is always a great merit. More we can hardly desire of a man. Beyond this he teaches to be very good, to do much good; and I believe that from his kind and beautiful eyes. In short, I like the man."

Miss Bremer came to this country expecting to find new developments of what she calls "*the great humanity*," a new condition of social life. Again and again, as we have followed her in her occasionally really earnest pages, and seen her forgetting the "*Great Exemplar*," the "*Pattern Man*," and losing sight of the gifts which He purchased with His blood, has she seemed to us like one ever wandering about, seeking rest and finding none.

THE DUTY AND RESPONSIBILITY OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT IN RELIGION. A Sermon preached before the Protestant Episcopal Society, for the promotion of Evangelical Knowledge, October 9, 1853, at St. George's Church, New York. By STEPHEN H. TYNG, D. D. New York: Depository of the Evangelical Knowledge Society, No. 10, American Bible House, Astor Place, 1853. pp. 31.

Dr Tyng seems to make the same mistake, into which multitudes fall about creeds, *viz.*, he supposes them impositions of Church authority, as if they were like Rubrics, or Canons of discipline. The Church never manufactures a creed out of her own mind, to impose it as her dictum. The creeds are but her careful attestations of a preexisting faith, historically transmitted; and, of course, as historical proofs of the genuine faith, are of the highest order of guides in the correct interpretation of Scripture. Dr. Tyng seems to view them, as impositions of "mere Church authority," as though they were nothing but the Church's will or opinion:

and so throws every man back upon the naked text of Scripture, to determine for himself, what he himself shall believe, and what he shall reject. (Sermon, p. 18.)

Now, if this is the right way to settle doubtful questions in religion, then we beg its defenders to look ahead with care, and mark the associations and fellowships to which they legitimately pledge themselves. If historic interpretation of Religion, if all transmissive exposition of the Christian Faith, if the most solemn attestations of that Faith by the Church Catholic, are to go for nothing, or as mere suggestions, and every one, young and old, male and female, wise and ignorant, is alike to be thrown back upon the naked text of Scripture, and erected into a sovereign judge, (sovereign, at least, for every individual)—if this is the cure-all for error, why, so be it. We have not the slightest objection to make against such umpirage, if it be correct; and, especially, if it be a balm for all the Church's bruises. All we have to say is this. Let the rule be faithfully carried out, and its consequences met with unshrinking candor. The rule is one which the Universalist, the Socinian, the Pelagian, and any heretic you may name, adopts with entire complacency. They all say, with Dr. Tyng, creeds are the imposition of "mere Church authority," and we may fall back upon the Scriptures, interpreted by the light of our own minds, as the ultimate appeal, and the only authoritative arbiter.

Now, will Dr. T. call such men brethren, or heretics? will he take them by the hand, as standing on *his* platform; or, to each say, stand by, for I am holier than thou, in the comprehension and profession of the true faith? If the latter; and they ask him, by what authority doest thou this thing? he will answer, by the Word of God. But their retort will be, by this same Word we say no; and, by your own rule, our interpretation of the Word of God is as good as ours. We ask you to take us into fellowship; we are as thorough private-judgment men as you are.

Will Dr. T. demur? On what ground can he possibly do so, but by appealing to the Church, and to the Church's attestations of the faith, "through the ages all along"? Such an appeal, however, some call by ugly names, such as Tradition-mongering, Romanizing, High-churchizing, &c. &c.; and so, we suppose, he will eschew it, as if it were "hot burning coals." Well then, (for we mean to be very good-natured about the matter,) if that will not answer, *WHAT WILL?* We shall be profoundly obliged to Dr. Tyng, to tell us. We know no better appeal to settle questions about the construction of Scripture, between us and heretics, who have as good private judgments as anybody, but the historical testimony of the Church, given in the Creeds, in the definitions of Councils, in the witness of orthodox men, who have stood approved from century to century. If this will not suffice, and we are thrown back upon naked Scripture, interpreted as many ways as there are minds, we cannot see, for the life of us, but that everybody is right for himself, and error, heresy, and schism impossibilities, which we might as well cease deprecating in our solemn Litany.

Meanwhile, waiting with fraternal patience for Dr. Tyng's substitute for the Church, her history, and her councils, we shall take the liberty, in no unkind spirit, to make the following suggestions:

Truth is a strait and narrow way, with an offset on each side; and you do not go most safely, when you see a man tumble down the *right* offset, by sheering away with all your might in the opposite direction. For you may tumble down on the *left* side. The Romanists have abused Tradition. The cure, in our view, is not to reject *all* Tradition; and let every one judge for himself. Yet, with too many, the contrariety of a thing is its reformation. Not so. The Romanists pray for the dead; but John Knox did not cure the difficulty, by forbidding, in his old Scotch Liturgy, *all* praying at a funeral. The Romanists have perverted the Fathers. But it is not therefore best to write about them, as Daille did, till one thinks them babbler, twaddlers, or liars. The old-fashioned Lutheran Clergy opposed the Pietists; and what did Gottfried Arnold do, but write a Church History, which told such stories about the misdoings of Clergymen in all ages, that people began to think *all* Ministers an incumbrance, or a pest. Gottfried Arnold was, probably, (most certainly in his own private judgment,) a very pious, and a very honest man. He did more, notwithstanding, to found a School of Sceptics in

Germany, than any one had done before him. And probably John La Placette did as good service to Scepticism in France, when he wrote about the incurable Scepticism of the Romish Church ; but, in such a way, as to unsettle our faith in all history whatsoever. Bishop Berkley tried to prove the reality of spirit, by demonstrating the unreality of matter. Hume took his principles up, and demonstrated the unreality of mind into the bargain !

Now, (Heaven forbid it,) but as we read human history, and human nature, we gravely fear that men will take up Dr. Tyng's principles about Private Judgment, and say that there is no such thing as heresy, but that we are all right and all good, together ; and all going strait to the same Heaven, albeit by roads which our individual tastes make different. We have never ceased to entertain what may be called a wholesome horror of mending our ways, by getting as far off as possible from some people, since we read the rebuke of King James to Dr. Reynolds. The good man was recommending the complete opposite, in everything, to Romanism. "Doctor," said the King at last, "the Roman Catholics wear shoes and stockings—do you mean we shall all go barefoot ?"

THE RULE OF FAITH, as maintained by the Fathers and the Church of England.

A sermon preached before the University, in the Cathedral Church of Christ, in Oxford, on the fifth Sunday after Epiphany. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D. D., &c. Oxford, 1851 : J. H. Parker. 8vo, pp. 69.

THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST. A sermon, preached before the University, in the Cathedral Church of Christ, in Oxford, on the second Sunday after Epiphany, 1853. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D. D., &c. Oxford, 1853 : J. H. Parker. 8vo, pp. 74, with a promised Appendix.

In his sermon on the Rule of Faith, Dr. Pusey, whatever were his views once, now freely and cordially adopts the old-fashioned Church of England notion, that the Scriptures are the rule of faith, and the primitive Church, with her definitions, expositions, and attestations, the rule of interpretation, in preference to individual judgments ; more especially modern ones. Thus, on p. 15, he says, in terms which ought to satisfy any sober and moderate Churchman, of any school : "The tradition, of which so much is said in the Fathers, is not a supplementary, not an independent source of truth ; but a concurrent, interpretative, definitive, and harmonizing witness of one and the same truth. They are not separate truths, apart from Holy Scripture, but the same body of truth which is in it ; not to supply anything wanting in Holy Scripture, but to explain what is in it ; not to add to our knowledge, but to prevent our misunderstanding it, or failing to understand the depth of the words which God the Holy Ghost spake."

The sermon, like most of Dr. Pusey's sermons, is exceedingly erudite ; and, with its multiplied references and notes, is a young Thesaurus for students, in relation to its particular topic. Thus, on p. 44, the author gives references and hints enough to furnish data for a capital history of the clause, *filioque*, introduced (as he correctly traces it) by the Spanish Church into the Nicene creed. Had Dr. Pusey never written otherwise than in *this* sermon, we apprehend that very few would have found fault with him.

In respect to the sermon on the Eucharist, he will probably be thought to have retraced the ground which he formerly took, respecting that Sacrament, and by which he produced such intense excitement. He distinctly asserts, and he is certainly entitled to the benefit of such an explanation, that the chief reason why his former sermon on the Eucharist was so grievously condemned, was, because its statements were popular and rhetorical, and not designed to be interpreted with dogmatic precision. Of course, he now gives us his sentiments with more precision ; and there is a summary of them made by himself, in his preface, the force of which our readers can judge of to their individual satisfaction, as we shall quote it. "In this sermon, I have dwelt on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, in itself ; and have, therefore, of necessity, spoken more distinctly on the objective presence of our Lord therein ; and, on the other hand, I have stated the grounds why I believe, with the Church of England, that this real and objective presence does not involve

any physical change in the natural elements, which are the veils and channels of our Lord's unseen presence. It is, I believe, the explanation of the former sermon, which, had opportunity been allowed, I should have given ten years ago."

Dr. Pusey's definition here, is tantamount to that of the Cambridge Confession of the New England Puritans, which formally declares, (Ch. xxx, 7,) that the body and blood of Christ, in the Eucharist, though "not corporally or carnally in, with, or under, the bread and wine," are, notwithstanding, "as really, but spiritually present, to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to the outward senses."

In the body of the sermon, he is particularly careful to prove, not only that he himself believes in no such physical change, as the Papists do, but that the Fathers also never did, and that their language is not to be rigorously and metaphysically interpreted, as it was by the divines of the Middle Ages. He reminds us of old Selden here, who said so tersely, that Transubstantiation was rhetoric converted into logic. He admits, what a Romanist would ignorantly think a concession, that the Fathers employ such words as transmute, transform, transelement, but adds, as an acute historical theologian ought to do, "those words do not express the doctrine of the scholastic divines." Nay, he subjoins, "all these words are, also, by the very same Fathers, used of spiritual changes, which do not involve change of substance." (Sermon, p. 43.)

Dr. Pusey believes, then, in Christ's Sacramental presence only, in the Eucharist; and contends that, with the Confession of Augsburg, (which surely ought to be good Protestant authority,) the standards of the Church of England "offer no physical explanation." (Sermon, p. 16.)

Would that the Church at large had been always content with such a statement; for, what is gained by a philosophical or metaphysical explanation, like Transubstantiation, we are utterly unable to see. Would a Romanist expect to glean from *his* Eucharist something more than the benefits of Christ's cross and passion? Would he desire anything beyond such benefits? Nay, rather could he desire more than the blessedness which such benefits will assuredly convey? But these same benefits are professedly gleaned from the Eucharist, by all Christians whatsoever; at least, all Trinitarian Christians. The Cambridge Confession, *e. g.*, solemnly declares, that the Eucharist is to be observed for the showing of Christ's sacrifice in his death, and for "the sealing of *all* benefits thereof unto true believers." And we well remember, how profoundly we were struck, years since, in reading an address of *Zuingle himself* at a communion, on finding him tell his hearers, that irreverence towards the elements was irreverence towards Christ's own person, exactly as if he were there visible to mortal eyes. So, *practically*, Zuingle identified Christ with the ordinance which commemorated him. Could a Romanist have done more?

Wherefore, we rejoice to believe, that in the virtue, the efficacy, the sanctification of the Eucharist, all Trinitarian Christians agree. And our inference is, that to attempt to pry into the nature, objectively, of the Sacrament, *i. e.*, its nature in itself considered, is as idle, and as futile, too, as to inquire, with scholastic subtlety, *how* the two separate natures of Divinity and Humanity can become incorporate in the one person of Christ. We can believe in the grand fact of the Incarnation, and welcome its inestimable mercies, without comprehending, at all, *how* the Divine and the Human can thus be blended. And so we can believe in the union of the physical and the spiritual in the Eucharist, and receive, as the venerable Confession (would that modern Puritans thought as well of it as we do) as the venerable Confession of Cambridge says, "*all* benefits thereof," without knowing *how*, philosophically, this can be accomplished. Long have we thought thus, and that there is common ground for all Trinitarian Christians in a theory of the Eucharist, which is perfectly sufficient for all the purposes of spiritual life and virtue; and if this may be, it is worse than idle to go further. It is as perniciously idle as to wrangle about the philosophy of Predestination. And, in very deed, Rome, with her dogmatizing about the metaphysical character of the Eucharist, is just as excessive, and just as overbearing, as the Calvinist, when he insists that *his* metaphysics, and *his* only, can make the mysteries of Predestination self-consistent.

We will add, in closing, that this is one of the *not few* instances, in which extremes in dogmatizing come together in unity, or run side by side in a curious parallel.

PRÄKTISCHE ENGLISCHE GRAMMATIK, &c., i. e. A Practical English Grammar, according to THOMAS BRYAN. An indispensable Manual for all who would learn to speak, promptly and correctly, the English Language. Improved and enlarged, by Professor REINALD SCHIEDER, Teacher of the English, German, and French Languages, in Brooklyn, New York. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1853. pp. 189. 12mo.

This is a concise Grammar of the English language, designed to aid Germans in acquiring a correct and practical use of good English. Of course, it is written in the German language; and to each English word, when first introduced, the true pronunciation, according to the German system of orthography, is stated. The book explains correctly, and fully illustrates by examples, most of the peculiarities of the English language, so far as they differ from the German; and subjoins to each of the forty Lessons, into which the work is divided, one or more exercises of German composition, to be turned into correct English. At the end of the book is a Key to all the Exercises. This is the only book we have seen having the same design; and it appears to us well adapted to common use among our German population.

A HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the first invasion by the Romans to the accession of William and Mary in 1688. By JOHN LINGARD, D. D. A new edition, as enlarged by Dr. Lingard shortly before his death. In Thirteen Volumes. Vol. III. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co., 1853. pp. 339. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

We have little, at present, to add to what was said in the July No. as to the character of Lingard's History. It should be read as being generally reliable on English history previous to the Reformation; and as saying all that is capable of being said, and a good deal more, on the Romish side, subsequent to the Reformation.

GOD WITH MEN; or, Footprints of Providential Leaders. By SAMUEL OSGOOD, Author of "Studies in Christian Biography," &c. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. New York: C. S. Francis & Co. New Haven: T. H. Pease, 1853.

Abraham, Moses, Aaron, Saul, David, Solomon, Isaiah, John, the Messiah, Peter, Paul, John, the Disciples, and the Theologians—these are the author's "Providential Leaders," in making known the great truth "God with men." Mr. Osgood is thoroughly Unitarian, and from his lofty height of charity he looks down with sublime indifference upon such paltry things as dogmas and creeds, ministries and ceremonies. With him "life and spirit" are everything; and the great high priests of his temple are alike Clement, and Origen, and Kempis, and Fenelon, and Fox, and Penn, and Swedenborg, and Channing, and Bunsen, and Bushnell. Mr. Osgood is not a whit more radical—he is only a little more consistent—than some modern writers who claim to be orthodox *par excellence*.

AN ATTEMPT to exhibit the True Theory of Christianity as a consistent and practical System. By WILLIAM S. GRAYSON. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1853. 12mo. pp. 364. New Haven: H. H. Babcock.

We have tried to understand, or rather to read, that we might understand, this book; but, at present, can only say, in the language of the author,
Abyssus abyssum invocat.

MEN AND THINGS AS I SAW THEM IN EUROPE. By KIRWAN. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1853. 12mo. pp. 285. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Kirwan, alias Rev. Dr. Murray, himself a converted Romanist, has somewhat distinguished himself by his popular tractates against Popery. His "Men and Things" has little merit, except for its testimony as to the tendency of the Popish religion on public virtue, happiness, and intelligence. His unqualified statements on

this point are startling. The great mass of the people will never believe that a good tree can bring forth such fruits. Still he is too unqualified, too passionate in his denunciations, to have much influence with sensible people. His *forty-four* chapters are the briefest possible sketches of his visits in western Europe, and are almost barren of information.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND LABORS OF THE REV. ADONIRAM JUDSON, D. D. By FRANCIS WAYLAND, President of Brown University. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 544, 522. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Dr. Judson was the son of a Congregationalist minister, in Massachusetts; was educated at Brown University, R. I.; entered Andover Theological Seminary, where he professed to be converted. In 1810, he, with three others, Samuel Nott, Jr., Samuel J. Mills, and Samuel Newell, united in the determination to become foreign missionaries, and this was the origin of the Foreign Missions of the Congregationalists and Presbyterians in the United States. In 1812, Mr. Judson embarked for India; and soon after the termination of the voyage, he, with his wife, adopted Baptist opinions, and at Serampore both were immersed. This led to the organization of the American Baptist Board of Missions. It ought to be said that the *English Church* missionary, Buchanan, by his work, "The Star in the East," was the means of first stirring up this Foreign Mission movement in this country. In respect to the life, character, and labors of Dr. Judson, we must refer to these volumes of President Wayland. He was a man of very strongly marked character; one of those men who leave their mark upon their age; by nature possessing an undaunted moral courage, an iron will, a head-strong ambition, an unhesitating self-reliance, and all made subservient to one ruling object. Dr. Wayland had expected to find in Dr. Judson's correspondence ample materials for biography. In this he was disappointed; for, although few men wrote more letters, or had more numerous private correspondents, hardly anything has been spared but his official communications to the Baptist Board of Missions. He, himself, "from peculiar views of duty, destroyed all his early letters written to his family, together with all his papers of a personal character. Mrs. Judson, from prudential reasons, during their captivity in Ava, destroyed all his letters in her possession. Manuscripts were also consumed by the burning of Mr. Stevens's house in Maulmain. Dr. Judson's correspondence with Dr. Stoughton perished by the shipwreck of a vessel on the passage from Philadelphia to Washington. Last of all, his letters to his missionary brethren in Burmah were lost by the foundering of a ship, which was conveying them to this country." It would be easy to show that he exhibited not only great eccentricities, but great faults of character. As an illustration of how much can be done by a single man, his life deserves to be studied.

LECTURES TO YOUNG WOMEN. By WILLIAM G. ELLIOT, JR., Pastor of the Church of the Messiah, St. Louis. Third Edition. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co., 1854; 12mo. pp. 196. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

The writer of these Lectures is, we suppose, a Unitarian preacher; and he exhibits that thoughtfulness and moral culture, that freedom from cant and from the shackles of mere sect, which distinguish the better class of their preachers; and in which the real strength of their system mainly consists.

THE RHETORIC OF CONVERSATION; or, Bridles and Spurs for the Management of the Tongue. By GEORGE WINFRID HARVEY. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1853. 12mo. pp. 380. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

This volume contains some admirable hints on conversation; also notices of the habits of some of the most distinguished conversationists, as Johnson, Coleridge, and others; and also accounts of some conversation clubs. It is altogether a readable and useful book; and is well calculated to direct attention to the proprieties of social intercourse.

READINGS FOR A MONTH, *Preparatory to Confirmation*. Compiled from the Works of Writers of the Early and of the English Church. By the Author of "Amy Herbert," &c. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1853, 12mo. pp. 323. New Haven: H. H. Babcock.

We need not say of this last work of Miss Sewell, that it bears the marks of her usual purity of style, and depth of religious feeling. She is so earnest and devout, that we would much rather commend than find fault. But there is in this, as in other of her publications, a vein of teaching which, at the present day, especially, cannot be passed over in silence. It is contrary to Holy Scripture and the early Fathers. It is, in flat contradiction to the teaching of the English and our own Church. We mean the extravagant and unauthorized effect which she ascribes to the Sacrament of Baptism. We are as earnest as Miss Sewell in our belief of Baptism as a means of grace; and that in the case of infants. But neither we nor she has a right to ascribe such effects to Baptism as she does ascribe to it, and still profess to belong to the Reformed Church. It is Trentine Romanism, and is a part and parcel of that system. Ives and Manning both embraced it, before they apostatized; and it is the true secret of their apostacy. Holding such doctrines, it is not "insanity" to go to Rome. The following are specimens of Miss Sewell's teaching:

"The several states of sin are so many fallings away from the state of baptismal grace." p. 10.

"The Church is 'Holy,' because, although its members are not all holy, yet they have all been once made holy at Baptism." p. 149.

"In holy Baptism, God recreates us in his own image." p. 313, &c., &c.

Now, we know perfectly well where all this sort of doctrine came from. As Churchmen, it suffices to say, it is in the very teeth of Article IX,—as well as of the Liturgy of the Church. No person can hold it consistently, and not hold therewith the whole system of *perfunctorism*, in which masses for the dead is the last act in the drama, and in which the personal faith of the soul in Christ has no part upon the stage. Let the opposers of *this* doctrine brand it with what opprobrious epithet they may, as "Lutheranism," or any other term of reproach, it is yet the doctrine of St. Paul and of the Church, and between it and Romanism there is no middle ground.

A SELECTION FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE OF THE LATE THOMAS CHALMERS, D. D., LL. D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, LL. D. 12mo. pp. 504. New York: Harper & Brothers. New Haven: H. H. Babcock.

The private thoughts of such a man, freely expressed to his friends, on some of the most important subjects of the day, cannot but be a most attractive volume. The reader will rise from a perusal of these letters with a strong impression of the gigantic proportions of Chalmers' character. He was, beyond a question, one of the most commanding intellects of our age. We cannot but respect a really great, earnest, and devout man, however strongly we may differ from him on most important points.

THE MUD CABIN; or, the Character and Tendency of British Institutions. 12mo., pp. 312. New York: D. Appleton & Co. New Haven: H. H. Babcock.

We are not surprised at the appearance of such works as this, designed to exhibit the wretchedness which festers in the bosom of English society. The sympathy with abolitionists, the interference with our domestic institutions, which have of late been exhibited, in the most marked manner, in England, may as well be spared until she has removed the beams from her own eye. Mr. Isham, the author of this work, has not exaggerated the scenes which he so forcibly describes. There are evils existing, for which Great Britain is responsible, in her foreign as well as her domestic policy, which might well cause the cheek of every Englishman to blush for shame. It is an ungracious task to use such weapons; it is sometimes an almost necessary one.

THE MISSIONARY'S DAILY TEXT-BOOK. With Reflections, Biographical Notices, Prayers, or Devotional Poetry, for every day in the year. Canterbury: Printed at St. Augustine's College Press, 1853.

This compilation was made, we believe, by the Rev. Mr. Baily, Warden of St. Augustine's College, &c., for the use of students in that Missionary Institution. To all such students it is peculiarly appropriate, and certainly may be used with spiritual profit by all Christians; for they too possess the missionary spirit in proportion as they are like unto their Master.

BUSY MOMENTS OF AN IDLE WOMAN. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854. 12mo. pp. 285. New Haven: H. H. Babcock.

This volume contains five papers, or stories of fashionable life, very well written, and nearly all tending to disclose, in one form or other, the utter heartlessness and wretchedness which often are hidden by the outside glitter from the gaze of the world. The conventional artificialities of the world of fashion are a greater tyrant, and are more prolific in misery and crime than is often dreamed. The writer of this volume is capable of exposing the evils to which society in this country is particularly exposed.

DAILY STEPS TOWARDS HEAVEN; or, Practical Thoughts on the Gospel History, and especially on the Life and Teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. For every day in the year, according to the Christian Seasons; with Titles and Characters of Christ; and a Harmony of the Four Gospels. From the third London Edition. New York: P. E. S. School Union. 1853. 18mo., pp. 416. New Haven: G. B. Bassett & Co.

This most excellent work has already reached a second edition. If such books as these are used, as well as bought, the age of deep, humble, and fervent piety has not gone by. It is so little like the popular books of the day, which, at best, only tend to foster a noisy, shallow, pharaasical religionism.

THE CONFLICT OF AGES; or, the Great Debate on the Moral Relations of God and Man. By EDWARD BEECHER, D. D. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co., 1853. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

We have here, doubtless, an honest and well meant attempt to settle a "conflict," which has, indeed, been one of "ages." The author assumes, as historical fact, that, what he terms the moving powers of Christianity (by these meaning the native depravity of man, and his intuitive principles of honor and right—which are moving powers only in reference to the human recipiency of Christianity) have been from the first in violent antagonism. He holds that the ordinary theory, which traces Original Sin to the fall of Adam, as the race's federal head, is in irreconcileable conflict with those intuitive principles of honor and right, which are as certain as human nature itself. With the serene, complacent assurance of one who indulges no doubts as to his competency for the task, he presents what he deems a very simple and satisfactory method of adjustment of the whole difficulty. The distinguishing feature of this method is, the doctrine of the *soul's preexistence*. The elaboration and proof of this notion occupy the bulk of the book. The author strives to show, that it was in a previous state of being that human nature contracted its sinful bias; and that God has graciously permitted it to reappear here in the flesh, where, as a probationer, it may have a new and improved chance to retrieve its miserable fortunes. Thus, before the wand of this new enchanter, the "Conflict of Ages" fades instantly away.

Now, we have to say, concerning this notion, in the first place, that, like every other *ism* of New England, for the last half century, it has not even the charm of novelty. We find this notion prevalent among all the early writers who adopted Platonism, as the philosophical exponent of theology. Origen held, distinctly, that souls sinned before they were united to the body. Justin Martyr not only held, speculatively, but taught, dogmatically, substantially, the same thing. As for St. Augustine, though he adopted for a time the theory of the immediate creation by

God of every soul, yet, as soon as he saw the use which the Pelagians made of it, he rejected it, and advocated the doctrine of preexistence, so far as that there is a forfeiture, before birth, of the soul's innocence, and consequent privileges. In fine, this has been the common doctrine of nearly all Christian mystics in ancient and modern times.

In the next place, it only shifts the difficulty a little further back, in point of time; it does not at all remove it. The real difficulty is the existence of evil at all, anywhere, and at any time, moral or physical, under the Government of God.

And, in the next place, there is still the fatal objection to this newly vamped notion, that countless millions of souls pass out of their present state of being in early infancy, before any such remedial process as he supposes can possibly have reached them.

And, finally, we may add, that there is not even the show of Scriptural argument to sustain his theory; his examination of the Holy Scriptures being employed to get around, or over, or under, their evident conflict with his untenable positions. He finds in Revelation no positive contradiction or formal condemnation of his theory. Now, if the silence of Revelation on a disputed point is to be used as affirmative evidence, then are there few theological vagaries that may not be proved. But we can in no way so well illustrate the felicities of his Scripture argument, as by simply stating the fact, that he labors to show, that the well-known passage, (Romans v, 12, 19,) properly teaches no causative relation whatever between Adam's fall and the original sin of the race; but only the "pronouncing of a sentence of condemnation to natural death on all men, through the sin of Adam, as a type and illustration, both by similitude and antithesis, of justification and life eternal through the righteousness of Christ." This, certainly, is Scripture made easy.

In conclusion, we do not deny that there are mysteries in this subject which we cannot solve. The existence of evil is unquestionably a great mystery; but that mystery Dr. Beecher has not taken the first step to explain. We see how it is possible that mystery *may* be solved in that Great Plan of recovery—that Universal Remedy, provided for all, and offered to all; a scheme given for our grateful acceptance and humble obedience, and not as a theme for our presumptuous speculation.

As an indication of the theological bearings, and practical tendencies, of this work of Dr. Beecher, we notice that Unitarianism hails it, and not without reason, as a manifest token of the spread of what is termed "liberal Christianity." Indeed, so far as the controversy between modern orthodoxy and heterodoxy, in New England, is concerned, it is a virtual giving up of the whole ground for which Woods and Stuart, and the elder Beecher, have been battling for a quarter of a century.

A MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. WILLIAM CROSWELL, D. D., Rector of the Church of the Advent, Boston, Massachusetts. By his Father. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1853. 8vo, pp. 528.

All remarks upon this interesting volume are deferred until our next Number, when it will receive such attention as such an important contribution to our Church literature well deserves. As yet, the Church is not rich in such treasured memorials of her more distinguished sons.

HISTORY OF THE CAPTIVITY OF NAPOLEON, AT ST. HELENA, from the letters and journals of the late Lieut. Gen. Sir Hudson Lowe, and official documents not before made public. By WILLIAM FORSYTH, M. A. In 2 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1853. 12mo. pp. 633, 672. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

A public lecturer lately warned his auditors against disputing with two classes of persons, viz., women and editors; and he might have added also, with Frenchmen about the character of Napoleon Bonaparte. A false estimate of that great man, a blind admiration, has seized possession of a large portion of the American people. Splendid success first consecrated crime; and their sympathy was indignant at

the actors and instruments in his humiliation. No man, in this connection, has suffered more in popular estimation than Sir Hudson Lowe. O'Meara in his "Voice from St. Helena," and Las Cases in his "Journal," as well as Count Montholon, all seem to have conspired, by various methods, to create a false sympathy in Europe, in order to remove Napoleon from his ocean prison. Up to the present time it was supposed that Sir Hudson Lowe would, sooner or later, be heard in his own behalf, and in behalf of the British government. After the death of Sir Hudson, his papers came into the hands of the author, Mr. Forsyth, who has had every facility for consulting State papers, and who has done his work, certainly with masterly ability, and with great apparent candor. In his estimate of the character of Napoleon, he says, "His captivity illustrates the greatness and the littleness of man. He might have exhibited on that island rock a moral grandeur, which would have eclipsed the splendor of his imperial crown. But he knew not how to submit to his inevitable fate, and in the words of Lamartine, he contended with adversity as if it had been a human offense, instead of recognizing and being resigned to it as the merciful sovereignty of God. In that unequal and miserable struggle he condescended to resort to the most paltry tricks, in order to try and make men believe that he was the victim of malice, and the martyr of persecution." A voluminous Appendix contains copies of the original Letters and Documents, in proof and illustration of the author's statements in the course of this volume. It is an important work, and should be carefully read. We only add that Mr. Forsyth writes in a clear, manly, and vigorous style; and in our judgment, has successfully vindicated the character of a high-minded English soldier and gentleman.

MEMOIRS OF JOHN ABERNETHY, F. R. S., with a view of his Lectures, Writings, and Character. By GEO. MACILWAIN, F. R. C. S. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1853. 12mo. pp. 434. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

To the Medical Profession, especially, these memoirs of one of their most distinguished members must be attractive. He was born in London, April 3d, 1764; at the age of fifteen became a student in Surgery, under Sir Charles Blicke, and at the age of twenty-three was appointed assistant-surgeon in St. Bartholomew's Hospital, London, where he also was highly popular as a lecturer on Comparative Anatomy. He was perhaps equally distinguished both as a teacher and practitioner. He was next, if not superior, to Hunter, in elevating the character of his profession. Practical Surgery he first taught as a science; and he was among the first to advocate constitutional treatment in cases of local disease. He died April 20, 1831, at the age of 67 years. Professor Abernethy was an eccentric, irritable, and capricious man; yet there was in his character a vein of common sense, and a depth of solid worth, which his intimate friends fully appreciated. The author has preserved a large number of characteristic anecdotes, and the volume will be found interesting and valuable for its hints on the whole subject of disease and of medical practice. Its wide circulation would be a public benefit, and help to diminish the number and variety of quacks.

A HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the first Invasion of the Romans to the Accession of William and Mary in 1688. By JOHN LINGARD. In Thirteen Volumes. Vol. IV. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co., 1853. 12mo. pp. 337. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

After a notice, as above, of this work was in type, we received this additional volume. We only add, and that to call attention to the work itself, that it has become the fashion of our modern ultra-montanists to decry this history. Brownson, in his "Review," says, that it is not a "Catholic History of England," and that "the author writes as a disciple of the lowest Gallican school," &c., &c. The Papists did not formerly treat Lingard in this way. Is it because he has killed off the silly falsehood about the "Nag's Head Consecration?" He affirmed, when remonstrated with by the Romanists, that he had examined with care all the documents relating to Parker's Consecration, and that there was no reason to doubt its having been done in the Chapel, and by the Bishops named, in the proper form, &c. &c.

CHRIST IN HISTORY: or the Central Power among men. By ROBERT TURNBULL, D. D. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co., 1854. 12mo., pp. 540. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Dr. Turnbull, a Baptist minister, has already won the reputation of a vigorous, graceful writer, and of very considerable attainments in learning. The theme selected for examination in this volume is a vast one, and is discussed in its popular, rather than its historical, ecclesiastical, doctrinal, or philosophical aspect. The prominent ideas illustrated, are discussed under the topics of Christ in Ancient Religion; Christ in Ancient Philosophy; Christ among the Hebrews; Preludes and Preparations; the Fullness of Time; the Advent; the Discipline; the Mystic Theory; Christ's Teaching and Miracles; Christ in the Primitive Church; the Middle Ages; the Reformation; and in Modern Society. There is in the volume more of optimism and subjectivism; more reliance placed on that class of writers, and less well-defined precision as to what Christianity really is, than is called for by the times, and than any consistent Churchman would wish to see. It is, however, highly creditable to the author. But, what we most need now, is, that Christ shall be made known as a Living Power, rather than as a historical fact.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, in Greek and English, with an Analysis and Exegetical Commentary. By SAMUEL H. TURNER, D. D., Professor of Biblical Literature, &c., in the Gen. Theo. Seminary. New York: Stanford & Swords. 1853. 8vo., pp. 234.

We had relied upon a thorough Review of this volume for our present Number, which we have failed to receive; but which we shall hope to give hereafter. Of all the Epistles, this of St. Paul to the Romans is, emphatically, "hard to be understood," and has been most successfully "wrested" in the work of establishing theological speculations. Professor Turner deserves the thanks of the Clergy for the ability, the learning and candor, with which he has rescued portions of this Epistle from such perversion. We may instance the doctrine of "imputation," in Chapter Fifth; and of "indefectibility of grace," in Chapter Eighth. We most earnestly commend this volume, not only to the Clergy, but to the Laity, to all who would "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest" the Holy Scriptures. The learned Professor will, we cannot doubt, be abundantly encouraged to go on in the prosecution of a work which he has so well begun, and for which there is at the present day such pressing need.

LECTURES TO YOUNG MEN. By W. G. ELLIOT, Jr., Pastor of the Church of the Messiah, St. Louis. Third Edition. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co., 1854. 12mo., pp. 190. New Haven: H. H. Babcock.

In every respect, but one, these Lectures are models of what such Lectures ought to be. There is the absence of one great, central, absorbing Truth, the Cross of CHRIST. But there is in them an earnestness and directness of appeal, a recognition of the claims of young men on the Pastor's regard, which is admirable. Why are the young men of our country so generally and so increasingly irreligious? How shall they be reached? We put these two questions, first to the Clergy, and then to parents and sponsors.

MEMOIRS OF PIERRE TOUSSAINT, born a slave in St. Domingo. By Mrs. H. F. LEE. 1 vol. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co., 1853. 12mo., pp. 124. New Haven: H. H. Babcock.

A pleasing and well-written memorial of a West India slave; who exhibited that well-tried fidelity, civility, and integrity of character, which are not unfrequently met with among the servants of the South. He was a devout Romanist, and died recently in the city of New York.

OUTLINE OF THE GEOLOGY OF THE GLOBE, and of the United States in particular; with two Geological Maps, and Sketches of characteristic American Fossils. By EDWARD HITCHCOCK, D. D., LL. D., President of Amherst College. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co., 1853. 12mo, pp. 136. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

We do not know where else it is possible to get such a complete, bird's-eye view of the geological structure of the globe as in this volume, with its maps and illustrations. As a hand-book, or as an introduction to Lyell's large work, it is admirable.

ALL'S NOT GOLD THAT GLITTERS; or, the Young Californian. By COUSIN ALICE. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1853. 18mo, pp. 214. New Haven: H. H. Babcock.

"Cousin Alice" has written a beautiful story, in the true spirit of her motto; but she has not gone beyond the sad reality of facts. Life in California affords numerous instances in which "truth is stranger than fiction."

REPORT of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, for 1853. London: 1853.

REPORT of the Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society, &c., 1852-1853. London: 1853.

REPORT of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, for 1853. London: 1853.

PROCEEDINGS of the Prayer Book and Homily Society during its Forty-first year. 1852-53. London: 1853.

We are again indebted to the Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne, B. D., for the above Reports, of which we hope to give some account in the next Number of the Review. They are full of encouragement and of promise.

THE CLERICAL JOURNAL AND CHURCH AND UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE. A Record of Ecclesiastical Literature and Arts. London: Twenty-nine Essex street, Strand. Vol. I, No. 10.

This is a new newspaper, published on the 8th and 22d of every month, each number containing 24 pages. It says of itself: "This Journal is established to provide for the Clergy and Members of the Established Church, a complete collection of the Facts and News relating to the Church, and to the progress of Religious Literature and Art, which are of interest to all. It expressly avoids controversy and speculation, leaving these to the Journals that are the organs of particular sects and parties." We like the specimen number before us; and shall be glad to welcome it to our Editorial table regularly. We would not use every expression which we have noticed in it, yet it will we hope and trust be learned without dullness; Catholic without being Romish or latitudinarian; and moderate in tone, with no lack of zeal, and furthermore, be abundantly sustained.

PAMPHLETS, &c.

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, Weekly. Littell still caters for the public, with a comprehensive appreciation and good judgment. A late number has the famous Edinburgh Article on "Church Parties," which has been such a bombshell in England.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE, Monthly. This famous Magazine enters on a new volume with an edition of 135,000, and seems to be "got up" without regard to expense.

ARTHUR'S HOME MAGAZINE, Monthly, and ARTHUR'S HOME GAZETTE, Weekly. The purity of taste, and the winning manner in which "home" duties are inculcated, are making both these publications favorites with the public.

GODEY'S LADY'S BOOK, Monthly. Godey more than holds his own.

THE CARRIER DOVE, Monthly. Edited by the Secretaries of our Foreign Missionary Committee. It was a bright thought to send out such a "Carrier Dove." The work is exquisitely published, and will do great good. Two hundred copies are already taken among the children of a single congregation in Connecticut.

ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE OF ART, Monthly. New York: A. Montgomery. We think this the very best of the Pictorials, both in the objects illustrated, and the illustrations themselves.

GLASTENBURY FOR TWO HUNDRED YEARS. Rev. Dr. A. B. CHAPIN's Centennial Discourse, May 18th, 1853. With Appendix, &c. Hartford: 1853. 8vo. pp. 252. A mass of valuable Historical information; which attests, not for the first time, the indefatigable industry and indomitable perseverance of the author.

An Account of the Plymouth Celebration at Plymouth, Aug. 1, 1853.

The Bishop of Toronto's Charge to his Clergy, at the Visitation, Oct. 12, 1853.

Right Rev. Bishop Doane's Triennial Sermon, before the Alumni of the General Theological Seminary, Oct. 13, 1853.

Right Rev. Bishop Burgess' Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Maine, July 13, 1853.

Rev. T. T. Guion's Sermon on Alms-Giving, in Brooklyn, 17th Sunday after Trinity.

Rev. Dr. H. V. D. John's Funeral Sermon on the death of Rev. R. S. Killin, Baltimore, Sept. 11, 1853.

Rev. J. C. McCabe's Address at Hampton Academy, Va., July 30, 1853

RE-NATUS: or the two-fold Baptism of the Church. By a Presbyter, &c.

ULRIC VON HUTTEN's Epistle, congratulatory to the late Court of Bishops at Camden, &c.

Catalogue of the Nashotah Seminary, &c.

Journal of the Brotherhood of the Protestant Episcopal Church at New York, June 15, 1853.

Prospectus of Appleton's Edition of the British Poets.

Mr. Babcock's Remarks in New York Senate on the Roman Catholic Church Property Bill.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS DAVIS AND ATKINSON.

This important service was held in St. John's Chapel, New York City, October 17th. At 10 o'clock a procession of several Clergy in surplices, the two Bishops elect in their rochets, and twenty-seven Bishops in their robes, entered the Chapel. Six of the Bishops, including Bishop Spencer and the Bishop of Fredericton, took their seats in the Chancel; the rest were seated immediately outside, the two Bishops elect being in the centre, just before the Altar. The Church was densely crowded long before the hour of service arrived.

Morning Prayer was said by the Rev. Dr. Hanckel of South Carolina, the Lessons being read by the Rev. Dr. R. Mason, of North Carolina. The Bishop of Vermont commenced the Ante-Communion Office, the Epistle being read by the Bishop of Kentucky, and the Gospel by Bishop Spencer. The Sermon was preached by the Bishop of Fredericton.

The Sermon being ended, the Rev. Thomas Frederic Davis, D. D., Bishop elect of South Carolina, was then presented by the Bishops of Texas and Mississippi; and his testimonials were read by the Secretary of the House of Bishops, after which he took the oath of conformity. The Rev. Thomas Atkinson, D. D., Bishop elect of North Carolina, was then presented by the Bishops of Maryland and Alabama, and his testimonials were read by the Secretary of the House of Bishops; after which he also took the oath of conformity. The Presiding Bishop (of Connecticut) then moved the congregation present to pray, and the Litany, with the proper suffrage, was said by Bishop Spencer.

The interrogatories were addressed to the Bishops elect by the Bishop of Vermont, who also pronounced the invocation of strength and power upon them. The Bishops elect having then put on the rest of their Episcopal habits, the *Veni Creator Spiritus* was said by the Presiding Bishop and the others present, the Presiding Bishop saying also the Prayer for Grace. The Consecration was then given—Bishop Spencer, the Bishop of Fredericton, and several other Bishops, uniting with the Presiding Bishop in the laying on of hands.

The Bishop of Ohio then proceeded with the Offertory, and the Bishop of Kentucky said the Prayer for the Church Militant. The Bishop of Vermont Consecrated the Elements, and administered to the newly consecrated Bishops and the others of his Episcopal brethren. All the Bishops participated in administering to the hundreds of Clergy and Laity, who afterwards thronged to the Altar. The Post-Communion Service was said by the Bishop of New Jersey, the final Prayer and Benediction being given by the venerable Presiding Bishop.

CONSECRATION OF THE MISSIONARY BISHOP TO CALIFORNIA—
BISHOP KIP.

The Rev. William Ingraham Kip, D. D., Rector of St. Paul's Church, Albany, N. Y., was consecrated Bishop for the California mission on Friday, the 28th of October, at Trinity Church, New York City. Bishops Kemper, Boone, Lee, Freeman, Burgess, Whitehouse, Upfold, and Wainwright, were present in the chancel. Bishop Kemper, as first in seniority of those present, was the consecrating Bishop. The

service to the end of the Psalter, was read by the Rev. Dr. Berrian; the First Lesson by the Ven. Archdeacon Trew, of Nassau, in the Bahamas; the Second Lesson by the Rev. Mr. Hobhouse, of England; and Morning Prayer from the Creed by the Rev. Dr. Van Kleeck. The Anti-Communion service was read by Bishop Wainwright, Bishop Whitehouse reading the Epistle, and Bishop Boone the Gospel. The Sermon was preached by Bishop Burgess, from the 5th verse of the 1st chapter of 1st Thessalonians; and concluded with an earnest charge to the Bishop-elect, setting before him the exacting and self-sacrificing nature of the work to which he was about to be consecrated, and the encouragements held out to diligent labor. The candidate was then presented by Bishops Upfold and Wainwright, and after the usual testimonials were read by the Rev. Dr. Balch, Secretary of the House of Bishops, and the required promise of conformity made by the candidate, Bishop Freeman began the Litany, and the Consecration service proceeded, all the Bishops present joining in the imposition of hands. The newly-consecrated Bishop then entered the chancel, and the service was concluded with the administration of the Holy Communion.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

Name.	Bishop.	Time.	Place.
Bostwick, W. L.,	Brownell,	Oct. 2,	Christ, Hartford, Ct.
Brainard, John,	Brownell,	Dec. 18,	Christ, Hartford, Ct.
Gould, A. F.,	Rutledge,	Nov. 4,	St. John's, Jacksonville, Fla.
Priddy, N. C.,	McIlvaine,	Nov. 13,	St. Peter's, Delaware, Ohio.
Rally, W. B.,	McIlvaine,	Nov. 13,	St. Peter's, Delaware, Ohio.
Stone, Hiram,	Brownell,	Oct. 2,	Christ, Hartford, Ct.

PRIESTS.

Rev. Huckel, Wm.	Potter,	Oct. 2,	Evangelists, Philadelphia, Pa.
" Paddock, B. H.	Williams,	Sept. 29,	Trinity, Norwich, Conn.
" Palmer, E. B.	Eastburn,	Sept. 29,	Messiah, Boston, Mass.

REMOVALS.

Name.	To Church.	Place.
Rev. Bostwick, W. L.,	Trinity, Asst. Min.,	Newtown, Conn.
" Bolles, J. A., D. D.,	Trinity,	Cleveland, Ohio.
" Brooke, J. T.,	Ascension,	Baltimore, Md.
" Camp, N. W., D. D.,	Trinity,	Hoboken, N. J.
" Clark, Anson,	Emmanuel,	Rockport, Ill.
" Clover, L. P.,	St. John's,	Johnstown, N. Y.
" Corbyn, A. D.,	Rector College of St. Andrew,	Jackson, Miss.
" Du Bois, G. W.,	St. James',	Zanesville, Ohio.
" Maybin, D. C.,	St. John's,	Akron, Ohio.
" Morrison, T. R.,	Trinity,	Jacksonville, Ill.
" Sanford, D. P.,	Redeemer,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
" Stone, C. B.,	St. Matthew's,	Waukesha, Wis.
" Terry, E. R.,	Christ,	Boonville, Mo.
" Watson, J. L., D. D.,	Rector Burlington College,	Burlington, N. J.

CONSECRATIONS.

Church.	Bishop.	Time.	Place.
St. James',	DeLancey,	Nov. 15,	Syracuse, W. N. Y.
St. Luke's,	Potter,	Nov. 9,	Scranton, Penn.
Zion,	Potter,	Nov. 14,	Sterling, Penn.

OBITUARIES.

The Rev. NATHANIEL SPRAGUE, D. D., late Rector of St. Peter's Church, Drewsville, N. H., died at Claremont, N. H., Oct. 29th, 1853, in the 64th year of his age. He was the son of Peter Sprague, Esq., of Cheshire Co. N. H.; and was born Aug. 20th, 1790. At the age of 17, he entered Dartmouth College, but from an unfortunate impediment in his speech, a stuttering contracted from imitating, in early life, a companion, and which threatened to injure his usefulness, he remained in College but two years. He however continued his studies privately, and became a good classical and general scholar. He spent several years in the business of instruction, in Oneida Co., N. Y., and as Professor in Royalton Academy, Vermont. He also entered upon the study of law with the Hon. Jacob Collamer, of Royalton. At the age of 28, he became decidedly religious and joined, successively, the Presbyterian and Congregational Communions. The desolating excesses of the *Revival measures*, under Burchard and others, in 1835, shook his confidence in the ecclesiastical systems in which he had been educated; and at the age of 48, he was ordained Deacon by Bishop Hopkins, Oct. 17, 1838; and in due season was admitted to the Priesthood. His ministerial life was spent at Royalton, Vt., and from 1844, at Drewsville, N. H. His habit of stuttering was entirely overcome at the age of *thirty-six*, under the treatment of the Rev. Salem Town, of Granville, N. Y., now of Aurora, in that State. The writer from whom we gather this sketch of his life, and whom, from the initials, we suppose to be the Bishop of New Hampshire, bestows a high tribute upon him, as a man, a scholar, a Christian and a Minister. He thus describes the close of his life:

"The writer returned home from the General Convention just in time to give him the comfort of the Sacramental Supper. The chill of death was then upon his members. As the writer, with a heart weighed down by grief, approached his bedside, the latter fixed upon him the gaze of a clear and intelligent eye, and in a firm and manly voice pronounced, as nearly as they can be remembered, these words:—'I am glad to see you. I plainly perceive that I am drawing very near to the end of my earthly life. Not much longer am I here. But firm is my faith, and comforting is my hope to be in Heaven with my adorable Redeemer. I have thought it all over many times. This crisis has been distinctly before me for five months. Deeply has repentance stirred my soul as I have thought upon my sins. But I have a good hope through grace.' Jesus has all my confidence. I have not a shadow of doubt, that as He is received by the Church and as I have preached Him, so is the truth. I have not the shadow of a doubt, that as in weakness and much trembling I have declared Him, so shall I find Him. Praised be His name forevermore!'"

We also see it stated that Dr. Sprague had given about \$5,000 for the use of the Parish in Hanover, N. H., the seat of Dartmouth College, and his private library to the Parish at Drewsville, for the use of the Rector.

The Rev. STEPHEN PATTERSON, Rector of Christ Church, Vicksburg, Miss., died on Wednesday, at 9 o'clock, P. M., the 14th day of September, A. D., 1853, of yellow fever, and was buried the next day at 5 o'clock, P. M., in the yard of Christ Church, Vicksburg, of which Church he was the Pastor. From the *Vicksburg Whig* we gather the following tribute to his memory:

" Himself of a feeble body, he had the heart of a lion; with a frail constitution, he had an energy of iron. His spirit was too great for his strength. His will went far beyond his power. As his friends saw and feared the untiring labors of the day and night, for he scarcely knew either rest or sleep, proved too much for him, and he at length had the hand of the dread disease laid heavily upon him. He who had spoken words of comfort to so many, who had so often stood like an angel by the couch of pain, was at last stricken down; the o'ertasked body was illly able to resist the assaults of the destroyer. He died a MARTYR to his devotion to the sick, the destitute, the dying. Mr. Patterson, at the period of his death, was about thirty-five years of age. He was ordained a Deacon and a Priest by Bishop Otey, of Tennessee. He accepted the office of Rector of Christ Church, Vicksburg, in the year 184—, and continued to fill it to the day of his death. Immediately upon his junc-

tion with the Diocese, he took an active and prominent interest in its affairs, and has held the important post of President of its Standing Committee for several years. Upon the election of Bishop Green to the Episcopate of this State, he was appointed by the Convention the Committee of that body to bear to him the certificate of his election. He has been a regular attendant upon the annual Diocesan Conventions, and always taken an active and leading part in its discussions and deliberations. In 1850, he was chosen one of the delegates from this Diocese to the General Convention of the Church, held at Cincinnati in that year, and distinguished himself on the floor of the House of Clerical and Lay deputies as an eloquent and effective debater. The Diocesan Convention which adjourned in May last, again elected him a member of the approaching General Convention to sit at New York on the 5th of next month. His untimely death will leave a void even in that distinguished body that cannot readily be filled. It was his intention, if the hand of the messenger of death should be lifted from his people in time to have enabled him to do it, to take his place and discharge his duties as a legislator for the Church with his wonted zeal and ability.

"The Diocesan Convention of 1851 suggested and enforced the establishment of a Church paper in the Diocese, and singled him out of the Clergy of the Diocese to be the head of its editorial corps. He shrank from no duty imposed on him by the Church, and entered upon the office of an editor with the avowed object '*to do good to the souls of men.*' The '*Church Herald*' contains strong proof of his ability as a writer and his attainments as a theologian.

"As a scholar, his accomplishments were rare—his knowledge general and extremely accurate. There are few clergymen in the Church who, in these respects, would have borne a comparison with him. As a controversialist, had his attention been turned in that direction, we know no one who would have proved his superior. As a theologian, he had carefully examined and thoroughly understood the different theories in relation to the Church, the ministry, the sacraments and kindred topics, and he was from the profoundest conviction '*A Protestant Episcopalian.*' He leaned neither to the right hand nor to the left. His unpublished sermons and writings on these subjects contain a treasure of wisdom and knowledge which we hope will ere long be opened to the public."

The Rev. DAVID D. FLOWER, Rector of Christ Church, Pensacola, Florida, died at Pensacola, on Saturday, Sept. 10th, of the prevailing epidemic. He was a gentle, devoted, and faithful Christian minister. Although unacclimated he spared not himself in ministering to the sick and suffering around him, until he fell a victim to his zeal and faithfulness in this noble work.

The Rev. A. H. LAMON, Rector of St. John's Church, West Baton Rouge, La., died at that place, Oct. 28th, of the yellow fever.

The Rev. JOHN S. CHADBOURNE, officiating in Trinity Church, Natchez, Miss., died in that city, Sept. 28th, 1853. He, too, fell a victim to the yellow fever, contracted in the discharge of his heroic duties; and with Patterson, Dobb, and Flower, counted not his life dear unto himself. Mr. Chadbourne was a native of Maine; and is described by one who knew him as "a graceful scholar, a fine writer and a good theologian."

Rev. AMOS CLEAVER.—We are pained to add this name to the list of those who have fallen victims of the pestilence, and martyrs to duty. He died at Jackson, Miss., Oct. 17th. He was Principal of a flourishing Female Institute at Jackson, was a member of the Standing Committee, and filled other offices of trust. In all quarters we see testimony to his uncommon worth as a man and as a Christian. A short period before his death, to a friend, when speaking of his probable recovery, he said, "Whether I recover or not, is no business of mine—it belongs to God. If it is His will that I shall get well, I am content. If it is His will that I shall die, I am satisfied. His will be done."

Rev. N. H. ADAMS, Rector of St. Matthew's Church, Unadilla, New York, died Oct. 23d, of Typhoid Fever. He had been Rector of this charge for twenty-seven

years, having spent his entire ministry in this cure. A correspondent of the "Church Journal," says, "The generation of which he was a fellow, as well as that which had grown up under his ministrations, had learned to love him as a brother, and reverence him as a Father. And richly did he deserve such esteem and love. Of a quiet and amiable disposition, he never offended any man. It was the testimony, not only of the members of his Church, but of all others in that section of country, where the deceased has been well known for many years, that he died without an enemy, and that he had never known one. His Church were, as might well be supposed, exceedingly attached to him as their pastor. If prayers and tears and love could have saved his life, the writer of this would have been spared the painful duty of penning this obituary."

MISSIONS OF THE CHURCH.

The meeting of the late General Convention was looked forward to with much interest, in the hope, that measures would be adopted to increase the Missionary spirit, and promote more effectually the Missionary work of the Church. These results we believe have been secured. All that is now wanting is to carry forward the work so auspiciously begun. During the Session of the Convention, nine meetings of the Board of Missions were held at St. John's Chapel, on as many occasions. These were largely attended by the Bishops and other members, and the best spirit prevailed. The English Delegation added much to the interest of the meetings. We give, as follows, an abstract of the more important doings of the Board:

The first meeting of the Board was opened with Prayers, and a Sermon by the Bishop-elect of North Carolina.

On the 6th of October an application from California was presented by the Bishop of Western New York, requesting an appropriation to defray the expenses of an Episcopal Visitation of the Church in that State. It was laid on the table for the present.

The Provisional Bishop of New York announced that the English Delegation were in the city, and ready to be introduced to the Board. On motion of the Bishop of New Jersey, it was resolved that they be now received. A Committee, consisting of the Provisional Bishop of New York, accompanied by the Rev. Drs. McVickar and Turner, and Messrs. Bradish and Winston, waited on the Delegation, and on introducing them, the whole Board received them standing. Bishop Spencer, with a few introductory remarks, read the letter of "Commission and Instructions" given by the S. P. G. to its Delegation. [This was published in the *Church Review* of October.]

The Bishop of Virginia responded, welcoming the Delegation in the following words:

"In the name of this Board I desire to bid you, Right Reverend Brother, and your Associates, a hearty welcome to our land and to this Board. May the most sanguine hopes of the most sanguine friends of this your mission, be more than realized. May the Mother and Daughter Churches of England and America be henceforth more closely united and actively engaged in promoting those great doctrines of the Gospel for which our Protestant forefathers so nobly contended, and for which some of them laid down their lives. May your visit to our country be an useful and happy one. We have assigned you a seat amongst us, during the proceedings of the Board, which we hope will be interesting to you. The Provisional Bishop of New York will conduct you to the places prepared for you." On motion of Mr. Huntington, a Committee of seven was appointed, to confer with the English Delegation, in relation to the objects of their mission: to report to the Board the following afternoon. The Committee consisted of Bishops Kemper, Potter and Burgess; the Rev. Dr. McVickar and the Rev. Mr. Irving; and Messrs. Newton and Huntington.

On the 19th of October, the Committee of Conference presented and read their Report in full, but which from its length we are unable to publish. We can only say, it embodies the soundest principles, breathes the truest spirit, and is, in every respect, an important document.

Besides these meetings of the Board, public meetings were also held in the Church of the Ascension, on the evenings of October 7th and 10th, when public addresses were made by the Right Rev. Bishop Spencer, late Lord Bishop of Madras; the Rev. Mr. Caswall, and the Rev. Ernest Hawkins of the English Delegation; and also by the Bishop of Fredericton; also by Bishop Boone of China; Mr. Tong, a Chinese convert; the Rev. Mr. Syle, Missionary to China; and by the Rev. Dr. Stevens, of Philadelphia; by Bishop Eastburn, of Massachusetts; and the Rev. Dr. Tyng, of New York.

The Report of the Domestic Committee exhibits only about \$17,000 as the contributions of the last year. The action, however, taken in the appointment of Missionary Bishops to California and Oregon, and the feeling manifested in various ways, show that a new and brighter era has dawned upon the Church.

The Report of the Foreign Committee was read by the Rev. Mr. Denison. The total receipts had been \$42,500 89, and the expenses \$47,237 46. Large additions had been made to the Missionary force in China and Africa. The school at Athens is in a very flourishing state. There had been much suffering both in Africa and China by sickness and death, and the Rev. J. W. Cooke was affectionately commemorated.

In China they had now a chapel 60 feet by 30, and the number of baptisms had, in all, been 29; confirmed during the year, 5; communicants, 24, of whom 7 are under discipline, either for Romanism or immorality. The question of jurisdiction yet remains unsettled between Bishop Boone and the English Bishop of Victoria. The Committee closed with an urgent appeal for more funds, especially to meet the opening and boundless fields in China and Africa.

The following persons sailed lately for Cape Palmas: The Rev. J. Rambo and wife; Rev. R. Wright and wife; T. R. Steele, M. D.; Miss Anna M. Steele; Miss Sophia M. Smith; Miss Mary Ball.

The Committee have also under appointment the following persons, who will take passage by the first vessel: Rev. S. V. Berry and wife, colored; Mr. Hezekiah Greene, do. Two other clergymen have offered themselves for the same mission, proposing to leave for Cape Palmas next spring.

It appears, from a letter of Bishop Payne's, dated April 7, that Miss Williford's health is so shattered by the climate and its diseases, which incapacitate her for the performance of duty, that she returns to the United States, as her only chance of recovery. Under date of June 26, the Bishop further states that Mrs. Payne is a similar sufferer, and will accompany Miss Williford.

On motion of the Bishop of Pennsylvania, an exchange of Publications with the Board was proposed to the Secretaries of the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the Christian Knowledge Society, and the Church Missionary Society.

On motion of the Bishop of Georgia, the following were adopted:—

“Whereas, The United Church of England and Ireland, and the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, must always regard with affectionate interest the ancient Churches of the East, for so many centuries pressed down by a hostile religion; and

“Whereas, This Board, having suspended its missions to the decayed Churches of the East, in the dominions and dependencies of the Sultan of Turkey, would gladly see the attention of the Church of England more than ever directed to that part of Christendom: Therefore,

“Resolved, That this Board cordially concurs in the propriety of the suggestions relating to this subject, which were agreed upon in the conference between the Delegation of the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and a Committee of this Board, and which are numbered III, V, and VI, in the report of the Committee; and of the IVth, so far as it recommends the circulation of the Holy Scriptures and of the Book of Common Prayer.

“Resolved, That this Board respectfully requests the Senior Bishop of this Church to address a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, setting forth these views, as adopted by the Board.”

The Committee on the second resolution offered by the Committee on the Report of the Domestic Committee, reported, recommending—1. The appointment of some eminent presbyter as Secretary and General Agent of the Domestic Committee; 2. That Diocesan and Parochial organizations are absolutely necessary for the efficiency of this Committee; 3. That new interest should be given to the pages of the *Spirit of Missions*, and a small monthly sheet, similar to the *"Carrier Dove,"* be published; and 4. That a salary of — thousand dollars be appropriated to the support of the Secretary and General Agent of the Domestic Board.

EIGHTH DAY, *Friday*, October 21.—Bishop Brownell in the Chair. The following were presented, from the Secretary of the Lower House of the General Convention, as the members of the Board of Missions elected for the ensuing three years:—Rev. N. B. Crocker, D. D., Rev. W. Bacon Stevens, D. D., Rev. Christian Hanckel, D. D., Rev. P. A. Proal, D. D., Rev. A. H. Vinton, D. D., Rev. W. E. Wyatt, D. D., Rev. Horatio Potter, D. D., Rev. Francis L. Hawks, D. D., Rev. C. W. Andrews, D. D., Rev. H. W. Lee, D. D., Rev. Jacob L. Clarke, D. D., Rev. J. H. Morrison, Rev. T. C. Pitkin, Rev. S. L. Southard, Rev. W. H. Oulenheimer, Rev. A. C. Coxe, Rev. C. H. Halsey, Rev. M. H. Henderson, Rev. W. Suddards, Rev. J. A. Shanklin; Messrs. William Appleton, S. J. Donaldson, E. F. Chambers, R. H. Gardiner, S. H. Huntington, C. G. Memminger, G. M. Wharton, R. B. Minturn, J. C. Garthwaite, J. H. Wright.

The next Annual Meeting was ordered to be held in St. John's Church, Hartford, on the first Tuesday of October, 1854, at 3 o'clock, P. M.

The other Resolutions reported by the Committee on the depressed state of Domestic Missions, were then taken up. The second and third were adopted; the fourth was laid on the table.

The Annual Report of the Missionary Bishop of the North West, was read and referred to the proper Committee.

Order was taken for the printing of the minutes.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. Lee, it was

Resolved, That all moneys transmitted to the Treasurers of the Domestic and Foreign Committees, for the conversion of the Jews, not otherwise designated, shall be sent to the Treasurer of the Society for the Promotion of Christianity among the Jews, in London.

The Nominating Committee reported as follows:—

For the Domestic Committee—The Rev. F. L. Hawks, D. D., Rev. Lot Jones, Rev. C. H. Halsey, Rev. J. H. Hobart; Messrs. L. Bradish, J. D. Wolfe, R. B. Minturn, G. N. Titus.

Secretary and General Agent—The Rev. J. L. Clark, D. D.

For the Foreign Committee—The Rev. G. T. Bedell, Rev. S. H. Turner, D. D., Rev. S. H. Tyng, D. D., Rev. P. P. Irving; Messrs. L. Curtiss, J. F. De Peyster, F. S. Winston, S. Brown.

For Secretary and General Agent.—The Rev. S. D. Denison.

The persons nominated were accordingly elected.

On the 24th of October, the Committee on the Reports of the Missionary Bishops reported, calling the attention to the three following suggestions of Bishop Freeman, which they recommended to the consideration of the Domestic Committee:—1. That he should be allowed a missionary at large, whom he could leave at certain points part of the time; 2. That the appeal for St. Paul's College be earnestly forwarded; and 3. That an appropriation of \$500 be made to the Rev. Mr. Gillette, to aid him in his missionary work, as well as in the College. These suggestions were accordingly referred to the special consideration of the Domestic Committee.

Messrs. Newton, Chambers and Huntington were appointed a Committee on the Salaries for the Secretaries and General Agents.

The following resolutions, introduced by the Bishop of Georgia, on behalf of the Bishop of Pennsylvania, were adopted.

I. Resolved, That the Committees of this Board be instructed to make arrangements for a regular interchange of reports and publications on the subject of

missions, or for distribution in heathen countries, between the leading Church Societies of England and the Board of Missions.

II. *Resolved*, That, before establishing new Missions in any foreign country not included within the jurisdiction of the United States, or altogether independent of them, or sending a Missionary Bishop to such a country, this Board will enter into communication with the Missionary Bodies of the Church of England, should those Bodies pursue a corresponding course towards this Board.

III. *Resolved*, That this Board recognizes the importance of the suggestions contained in the Report of the Committee respecting Forms of Prayer, adapted to the condition of congregations not yet regularly organized or qualified to use our full Liturgy; and also respecting a Manual for the guidance of Missionaries in the discharge of their difficult and often delicate duties.

IV. *Resolved*, That this Board is deeply impressed with the necessity of more general and earnest prayer on the part of Christians, for an increase of laborers in the Vineyard of Christ, and for a blessing from God upon the ministrations of Evangelists and Pastors everywhere; and that forms of Prayer for this purpose, adapted to private and public use, and prepared under proper authority, are much to be desired.

V. *Resolved*, That the Domestic Committee be instructed to consider and report at the next Annual Meeting of this Board, what measures ought to be taken to secure the care and supervision of this Church in behalf of immigrants who have belonged to the United Church of England and Ireland, and to the Episcopal Church of Scotland.

The Committee on Salaries reported in favor of \$3,000 to each of the two Secretaries and General Agents; with an understanding that a part of this might be appropriated to the support of Local Secretaries and Agents, when they have them. The Report was adopted, and the Board adjourned *sine die*.

DEPOSITION OF THE LATE BISHOP IVES.

During the Session of the late General Convention at New York, on the 14th of October, a message was received by the House of Delegates, from the House of Bishops, informing the House that they had passed the following Resolution:—

Resolved, That a message be sent to the House of Clerical and Lay Delegates, informing them that the presiding Bishop was ready to pronounce sentence upon Bishop Ives, and that the House of Bishops were of opinion that it ought to be done in the House of God, and in the presence of the House of Clerical and Lay Delegates.

On motion, a resolution was adopted informing the House of Bishops that the House of Delegates were ready to receive them.

After the lapse of about ten minutes, the side door leading from the chamber of the House of Bishops was opened, and a procession of Bishops, headed by the venerable Bishop Brownell, entered the House, and were received by the President, (Rev. Dr. Creighton,) who vacated the Chair. The Bishops entered in the order of their seniority, and took their places in the Chancel. The whole House of Clerical and Lay Deputies rose, and received them standing.

The Bishop of Virginia then said the Lord's Prayer, the prayer for defense against "the sins of heresy and schism," from the Institution office; and the Prayer for Conventions. The Presiding Bishop then pronounced the following sentence:—

Whereas, Levi Silliman Ives, D. D. Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, in the Diocese of North Carolina—in a communication under his proper hand, bearing date "Rome, Dec. 23, 1852"—avowed his purpose to resign his "Office as Bishop of North Carolina," and further declared that he was "determined to make his submission to the Catholic [meaning the Roman] Church."

And Whereas, There is before the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, acting under the provisions of Canon I, of 1853, satisfactory evidence that the said Levi Silliman Ives, D. D., has publicly renounced the communion of this Church, and made his submission to the Bishop of Rome, as Universal Bishop of the Church of God, and Vicar of Christ upon Earth, thus acknowledging

these impious pretensions of that Bishop, thereby violating the vows made by him, the said Levi Silliman Ives, D. D., at his consecration as a Bishop of the Church of God, abandoning that portion of the flock of Christ committed to his oversight, and binding himself under anathema to the anti-Christian doctrines and practices imposed by the Council of Trent upon all the Churches of the Roman obedience:

Be it therefore known, that on the 14th day of October, in the year of our Lord, 1853, I, Thomas Church Brownell, D. D., LL D., by Divine permission, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the United States, with the consent of a majority of the members of the House of Bishops, as hereinafter enumerated, to wit: [Here the sentence gives the names and titles of the following Bishops, according to seniority: Meade, of Va.; Hopkins, of Vt.; Smith, of Ky.; McIlvaine, of Ohio; Doane, of N. J.; Otey, of Tenn.; Kemper, of Wisconsin and the Northwest; McCosky, of Mich.; DeLancey, of Western N. Y.; Whittingham, of Md.; Elliott, of Ga.; Lee, of Del.; Johns, (Assistant,) Va.; Eastburn, of Mass.; Chase, of N. H.; Cobbs, of Ala.; Hawks, of Miss.; Freeman, of the Southwest; Potter, of Pa.; Burgess, of Maine; Upfold, of Ind.; Green, of Miss.; Rutledge, of Florida; Williams, (Assistant,) of Ct.; Whitehouse, of Ill.; and Wainwright, (Provisional,) of N. Y.] and in the terms of the Canon in such case made and provided, do pronounce the said Levi Silliman Ives, D. D., *ipso facto* deposed, to all intents and purposes, from the office of a Bishop in the Church of God, and from all the rights, privileges, powers and dignities thereunto pertaining.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THOS. CHURCH BROWNELL, D. D. LL. D.,

Bishop of the Diocese of Connecticut, etc.

Thus ended this brief but most emphatic service, the deep solemnity of which seemed to strike all present, as with perfect silence they listened, and heard every word uttered by the Venerable Presiding Bishop.

The House of Bishops then withdrew, and the House adjourned.

GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, AND CHURCH BOOK SOCIETY.

Among the many causes of congratulation afforded by the recent assembling of the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity, in General Convention, not the least noticeable, in our opinion, is what was said and done at the Triennial meetings of the Board of Managers, and the Society whose name forms the caption of the present article. The admirable spirit manifested, the courtesy in debate, the evident willingness to endeavor to find and to occupy the common ground on which all Churchmen stand together, and the zeal, devotion, and interest, in the great and noble work of Christian education, all tended to make the Triennial meeting of 1853 the most important of all those which have been held since the formation of the Society. We shall greatly mistake if the Society do not henceforth take stronger grounds, and receive the entire confidence and hearty support of the whole Church. It is not to be concealed that the Union has not, in past years, had the entire confidence of a very large section of the Church. For ourselves, we have objected to some of its publications, *but* have believed that the evil would be corrected without an organized opposition. During the late Convention, frequent meetings of the Board of Managers were held, opinions were freely expressed, and a new Constitution was adopted by which the Society is to be called the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union and CHURCH BOOK SOCIETY. Certain Resolutions, offered by the Rev. Dr. Lewis, of Brooklyn, N. Y., which with slight alterations were adopted *unanimously*, and the enlarging of the Executive Committee, so as to represent more generally the various sections of the Church, had much to do in inspiring new confidence in this important instrumentality of our Church. The Preamble and Resolutions are as follows:

Whereas, There is among the great body of Churchmen in this country, substantial unity upon matters of vital interest; and,

Whereas, There has not been, during the late agitations in the Church, that general and united support of the Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union which it received in the earlier years of its existence; therefore,

Resolved, That, without expressing any opinion upon the doctrinal merits of any work heretofore issued, this Society approve and commend the declared purpose of the Executive Committee and Editor, as referred to in the Triennial Report read this evening, and recommend its execution, in revising their issues and taking from their lists or modifying any which may have been found seriously objectionable to any large body of Churchmen, retaining such only as belong to that ample field of Christian instruction in which Churchmen generally can meet and labor.

Resolved, as the sense of this meeting, That it should be the aim of this Society to secure to all Churchmen a representation in its management, so as to place all future operations upon a basis that will command the hearty support of the Church at large.

The following gentlemen were nominated and elected the new Executive Committee:—Rev. Jesse A. Spencer, D. D., Rev. Edward Y. Higbee, D. D., Rev. Wm. H. Lewis, D. D., Rev. Benjamin I. Haight, D. D., Rev. Jacob L. Clark, D. D., Rev. Gurdon S. Coit, D. D., Rev. Francis Vinton, D. D., Rev. Matthew H. Henderson, Rev. Charles H. Halsey, Rev. Isaac H. Tuttle, Rev. Thomas C. Pitkin, Rev. Cornelius R. Dufie; Messrs. John W. Mitchell, George C. Morgan, Abel T. Anderson, Robert R. Minturn, James F. De Peyster, Edgar J. Bartow, William A. Duncan, Henry E. Pierrepont, Abraham B. Sauds, John Hecker, William B. Douglas, John Buckley, Jr.

It is generally conceded as expressed by one of our exchanges, that the meetings, both of the Board and of the Society during this Session of the General Convention, have been remarkable for the numbers that have attended them, the general interest taken by men of all shades of opinion in its proceedings, the animation, yet the courtesy and kindness of the discussions, and the unanimity with which its final action has been so happily characterized. Universal confidence was expressed, on all sides, in the able, laborious and courteous Editor, the Rev. Dr. Spencer; and a high degree of satisfaction was also shown in regard to the most competent Agent, Mr. Dana. There is every reason to anticipate, with great certainty, a degree of confidence in the Society, and a vigorous extension of its labors and usefulness, far beyond its past services, and more than ever worthy both of its own capabilities and the increasing wants of the Church.

On the evening of *Sunday*, October 9th, at St. Paul's Chapel, the TRIENNIAL PUBLIC SERVICE was celebrated. Seven Bishops were present, including the Bishop of Fredericton. Evening Prayer was said by the Rev. Mr. Trapier and the Venerable Archdeacon Sinclair, of the English Delegation. The Triennial Sermon in behalf of the Union was preached by the Bishop of Mississippi. The Offertory was said, and the final Benediction given, by the Bishop of New Jersey. The collection amounted to \$190.12.

ENGLISH DELEGATION.

The Delegation from the English Society for the PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL to the late Triennial Meeting of the Board of Missions, held in New York, formed an interesting, and, in some respects, an important event. True, as a formal expression of the essential unity of these two branches of the Catholic Church, it was comparatively valueless. For the English Delegates came as the representatives, not of the English Church, but of a voluntary Society. And they were deputed to attend, not our National Synod, but a Meeting of the Board of Missions, sitting avowedly, not as a Synod, but as a Missionary meeting. Still, the spirit in which they were appointed, and with which they came, and in which they deported themselves, and in which they were received and treated on all occasions, public and private, was hopeful. The way is preparing for some more substantial and tangible proofs of the unity of these Churches. Aside from their reception by the Board of Missions, as mentioned above, the Delegation were, by formal Resolution, offered by Rev. Dr. Stevens, of Philadelphia, and supported by the Rev. Dr. Potter, of Albany, welcomed appropriately to the Convention, and conducted to seats provided for them during its sittings. And on Wednesday morning, Oct. 19th, the members of the Delegation from England, who were to sail on that

day for their homes, joined the House in its opening services, and were cheered by its prayers for their safe and prosperous return. The House took formal leave of them through a Committee consisting of the Rev. Drs. Potter, Stevens, and Hanckel; and Messrs. Luther Bradish and J. N. Conyngham. The House of Bishops adjourned in a body, to attend the Delegation to the Steamer Arabia; a mark of respect which would have been performed, we think, with much more propriety, by two of its younger Bishops.

We hope no proper efforts will be spared to cement, more and more, the hearts, and strengthen the hands of these two, Mother and Daughter, Churches. While the Protestant Sects are disintegrating themselves, and breaking up into a thousand fragments; and while the Church of Rome is consolidating her forces into a united, formidable, and haughty phalanx, the cause of Primitive Faith, Primitive Order, and the Primitive power of the Gospel, rests with the Reformed Churches of England, Ireland, and America.

We are glad to see that the Delegates, since their return home, and the English religious press, regard the whole movement as one deserving of unmingled congratulation. The *Guardian*, however, seems to have its dignified frigidity a good deal disturbed by an observed "tendency to a somewhat excessive laudation of American men and things."

TORONTO DELEGATION.

Among the most pleasing events of the late General Convention, was the presence of a Delegation, Clerical and Lay, from the Canadian Diocese of Toronto. The Synod by which they were appointed met in the Cathedral Church of Toronto, on Wednesday, October 12th. The Committee consisted of the following Clergymen and Lay Deputies:—The Rev. T. B. Fuller, the Rev. H. Patton, Rural Deans in the Diocese of Toronto; Messrs. John W. Gamble, and John Arnold. On their arrival, the Rev. Dr. Potter informed the Convention that there was now in the city a deputation from the Synod of Toronto, who had been entrusted with a message to the Convention. He moved that a Committee be appointed to introduce the gentlemen to the House, and that they have seats provided for them during the Session. The Committee consisted of the Rev. Drs. Potter, and Vinton of Massachusetts, and Mr. Newton of Massachusetts. They were then introduced by the Committee, and Rev. Mr. Fuller addressed a few appropriate remarks to the Chair, to which Dr. Creighton replied by welcoming them, and inviting them to seats in the Convention.

The Rev. Mr. Patton, also responded in an appropriate address. The feeling of pleasure manifested by the House, for the presence of the Toronto Delegation, as well as the Trans-Atlantic brethren, was too marked to be mistaken. Later intelligence assures us, that both Delegations have returned to their homes, not only gratified at their cordial reception, but greatly cheered by what they have seen of the Church in the United States.

THIRD PRESENTMENT OF THE RT. REV. BISHOP DOANE, AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE COURT.

We shall content ourselves with giving the results which have been reached in this case, referring those who would be more particular, to the printed Record of the Court lately published by Stanford & Swords.

On Thursday, Sept. 1st, 1853, Presentment having been made against the Rt. Rev. Bishop Doane of New Jersey, by the Rt. Rev. Bishops Meade of Virginia, McIlvaine of Ohio, and Burgess of Maine, the Court of Bishops, summoned by the Presiding Bishop, met in Camden, N. J., at 10 o'clock, A. M. The following Bishops were present, viz: The three Presenters, Bishops Meade, McIlvaine, and Burgess. The Respondent, Bishop Doane. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Brownell, who, as Senior Bishop, was President of the Court. Also, Bishops Hopkins, Smith, Otey, Kemper, McCoskry, Polk, DeLancey, Whittingham, Elliott, Lee, Johns, Eastburn, Chase, Freeman, Potter, Upfold, Rutledge, Williams, Wainwright. The following

were not present: Bishops Cobbs of Alabama, Hawks of Missouri, and Whitehouse of Illinois.

The Counsel for the Presenters—John C. Spencer, of New York; Henry W. Davis, of Maryland; William Halstead, of New Jersey.

For the Defendant—William M. Meredith, of Pennsylvania; George M. Wharton, of Pennsylvania; Judge Chambers, of Maryland; Judge Carpenter, of New Jersey; A. Browning, of New Jersey; J. L. N. Stratton, of New Jersey.

The Rt. Rev. Bishops Wainwright and Williams, were chosen Secretaries. No persons, not even the Counsel for the parties, were allowed to be present. The Court continued in session until Thursday, Sept. 15. On the preceding Tuesday, Sept. 13th, the Court had appointed a Committee, consisting of the seven Bishops who had not been present in the first Court convened upon the Presentment of Bishop Doane, which Committee was to confer with the Presenters and the Respondent, and see if any common ground could be agreed on without going into the trial. This Committee unanimously presented the following Report:—

The Committee appointed to confer with the Presenting Bishops and Respondent, to ascertain whether they cannot come to some understanding which shall be mutually satisfactory, and also fully answer the purposes of justice, beg leave to report that, upon consultation with the Presenting Bishops, they found that no understanding could be come to of the sort contemplated in the order of the Court—the Presenting Bishops feeling themselves unable to withdraw their presentment under any such acknowledgment of error as the Respondent would be willing to make.

The Committee then conferred with the Respondent, who expressed himself quite ready to acknowledge, as he had already done to some extent in open Court, such error as his conscience accused him of. The result of which conference was the paper embodied in the preamble and orders now submitted as a basis of a settlement of this vexed and painful question.

T. C. BROWNELL,	JAMES H. OTEY,
LEONIDAS POLE,	STEPHEN ELLIOTT,
G. W. FREEMAN,	JOHN WILLIAMS,
JONATHAN WAINWRIGHT.	

The following are the Preamble and Orders submitted by the Committee:

Whereas, Very serious embarrassments have been thrown in the way of the action of this Court by the postponement of the trial of the original presentment, and afterwards by the decree and orders of the Court of Bishops, which assembled at Camden, in 1852, and continued its sessions by adjournment at Burlington, to wit:—

Whereupon it was decreed, that whereas, previous to the making of the presentment now before this Court, the Convention of New Jersey had investigated most of the matters contained therein, and had determined that there was no ground for presentment; therefore,

Ordered, That as to the matters thus acted upon by said Convention, this Court is not called upon to proceed further.

Whereas, The Diocese of New Jersey stands pledged to investigate any charges against its Bishop that may be presented from any responsible source; and whereas, A Special Convention has been called, shortly to meet, in reference to the new matters contained in the Presentment now before the Court: therefore,

Ordered, That this Court, relying upon the said pledge, do not now proceed to any further action in the premises. Which decree and orders have been pleaded in bar to the trial of the present presentment; and whereas, the Convention of the Diocese of New Jersey has, through a Committee of its most influential and honorable laymen, satisfied itself that whatever may have been the imprudence, in word and act, of the Respondent, there was not intention of crime or immorality on his part—and whereas the Diocese of the Respondent is now engaged in raising \$135,000 for the release of all embarrassment of St. Mary's Hall, Burlington College and Riverside, the surplus income of which property, when thus released, is to be annually applied to the liquidation of the remaining debts of the respondent; and whereas, the Respondent comes into Court and says:—

The undersigned, in prosecuting his plans of Christian education, in connection with St. Mary's Hall and Burlington College, found that the expenses of the enterprise greatly exceeded his calculations; while the assistance on which he had confidently relied, perhaps too sanguinely, fell altogether short of what he deemed his reasonable expectations. In this condition of things, being entirely left alone and without advice, every step which he advanced involved him more and more deeply in pecuniary embarrassments. He admits that he made representations which, at the time, he believed to be correct; but many of which, turned out, in the event, to be erroneous. He was also led, by his too confident reliance in anticipated aid, to make promises, which he fully expected to perform; but which, experience has taught him, were far too strongly expressed. He was also induced, for the sake of obtaining money to meet his necessities, to resort to methods, by the payment of exorbitant interest on loans, which he did not suppose was in contravention of the law, and which common usage seemed to him to justify. He also, in entire confidence in his ability to replace them, made use of certain trust funds, in a way which he deeply regrets; and although they have long been perfectly secured, does not now justify.

The embarrassments here referred to were followed by a long, and well nigh fatal, illness, which, withdrawing him entirely from the business which he had carried on alone, was mainly instrumental in the entire failure in his pecuniary affairs. The perplexity arising from this failure, with the protracted infirmity which followed his sickness, made him liable to many errors and mistakes, which might easily bear the appearance of intentional misrepresentations. In connection with the assignment of his property, he set his name and oath to an inventory of his goods, and also to a list of his debts, which he believed to be correct—an act which he grieved to find had given rise to an impression in the minds of some, that he exhibited an insensibility to the awful sanctions of the oath of a Christian man; but, while he laments the impression, he declares, that this act was only done under legal advice, and in the firm conviction of its correctness. Some time after his recovery from the illness above alluded to, but while he was still in the midst of his perplexities, smarting under his heavy disappointments, and wounded by the imputations to which, in some quarters, he was subjected, the letter of the three Bishops came to him. He has no disposition to ascribe to them any other than just and proper motives in thus addressing him; but at the time when he received the communication, he received it otherwise, and, under the strong excitement of the moment, penned pamphlets, part of which he does not now justify, and expressions in which, in regard to those brethren, he deeply regrets.

In reference to his indebtedness, he now renews the declaration of intention which he has constantly made and has acted on to the utmost of his ability thus far—to devote his means, efforts and influence, in dependence upon God's blessing, to the payment, principal and interest, of every just demand against him—an expectation which there is reasonable hope of having fulfilled, since a Committee of the Trustees and friends of Burlington College, by whom both institutions are now carried on, having undertaken an enterprise which is nearly completed, to discharge the whole of the mortgage debt, and thus secure the property at Riverside and St. Mary's Hall, with that of Burlington College, to the Church for ever, for the purpose of Christian education; and this done, the Trustees have further agreed to appropriate during his life, the surplus income of both institutions to the liquidation of all other debts in carrying on the said institutions; that in the course of all these transactions, human infirmity may have led him into many errors, he deeply feels—he does not wish to justify or excuse them. If scandal to the Church, and injury to the cause of Christ, have arisen from them, they are occasion to him of mortification and regret. For these things, in all humility and sorrow before God and man, he has always felt himself liable to, and willing to receive the friendly reproofs of his brethren in Christ Jesus, and especially of the Bishops of this Church.

G. W. DOANE, Bishop of New Jersey.

Wherefore, ordered, that the presentment before this Court be dismissed and the respondent be discharged without delay.

The Committee likewise reported, as a part of the proposed basis of settlement, the following Orders:—

First. That no order or decree of the Court, in October, 1852, or of this Court, shall be taken to admit the right of any Diocese to come between a Court of Bishops and the respondent Bishop, after canonical presentment first made by three Bishops.

Second. That the Court believes the presenters to have acted in good faith, and in a desire and determination to carry out the law of the Church in such case made and provided, in the painful duty which they felt themselves called upon to perform.

The Report of the Committee being laid before the Court, the Presenting Bishops put in the following Paper, which was placed upon the Record:—

To THE COURT OF BISHOPS.—The Presenting Bishops, having been informed by a Committee of the Court, that a proposal is now under consideration to dismiss the Presentment, upon the several grounds stated in a report of the Committee, the chief of which is a certain acknowledgment on the part of the Respondent, do represent to the Court that the exclusive right of withdrawing the Presentment is with the Presenters—that the only legal mode of dismissing those charges by the Court is to try them by the evidence—that the Presenters stand ready with their evidence to enter on the trial which they have contended for, and they feel themselves bound to ask that the Court will call on the Respondent to plead guilty or not guilty to the Presentment.

With this statement of the legal position of the Presenters, as representing the Executive of the Church in this case, the undersigned are prepared to abide by such action as the Court may take in the premises.

(Signed)

WILLIAM MEADE,
CHARLES P. McILVAINE,
GEORGE BURGESS.

This being done, the Court proceeded to act upon the Report of the Committee, which was adopted without a single dissenting voice. The Presentment being thus unanimously dismissed, the Court after suitable devotions, adjourned, *sine die*.

Subsequently the Presenting Bishops published the following CARD, which it is due to them to place also on record.

The undersigned, having seen in the public papers, that an use entirely contrary to their own meaning has been made of the concluding sentence of the document submitted by them to the Court of Bishops immediately before the dismissal without trial of the Presentment of Bishop Doane, take this mode of stating their intention and design in the use of those words.

In declaring themselves “*prepared to abide by the action of the Court*” they meant simply to say, that, having labored to the utmost of their power to bring about a different result from that which they were assured was certain to take place with unanimity on the part of the Court, and having formally demanded, at the last moment, a trial upon the evidence, they had done all their duty, and should submit to the decision of the Court, and prosecute the case no further. But they were as far as possible from signifying anything like consent, or satisfaction, or acquiescence in the legal or moral propriety of such a decision, or any thing beyond simple submission. The undersigned further state, that at no stage of the proceedings did either of them, though repeatedly and earnestly solicited, entertain for a moment with any favor the proposal to withdraw the Presentment or consent to its dismissal on any consideration.

WILLIAM MEADE,
CHARLES P. McILVAINE,
GEORGE BURGESS.

New York, Oct. 15, 1853.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

The Triennial Meeting of the Protestant Episcopal Historical Society was held in St. George's Church, Stuyvesant Square, on Tuesday evening, October 18, at half-past seven o'clock. The Chair was occupied by Rev. Dr. Hawks, the

Vice-President; the President, Bishop Brownell, being absent. The Report of the Executive Committee was read by the Secretary, the Rev. Mr. Franklin.

From this Report it was shown that the Society was founded in Hartford, in June, 1850, having for its object the collection and publication of records relating to the Anglo-American Church, each member to be assessed \$2 annually for this purpose. These objects met with universal favor, and shortly after its organization the whole Bench of Bishops were enrolled as members. But, it seems, forgetfulness proved stronger than interest, few of the members having paid their assessment. This neglect necessarily retarded the labors of the Society, but yet it had, during the past year, succeeded in printing two volumes, one of which is now ready for distribution; a large collection of tracts, &c., had also been obtained, and now awaits but the binding. The Report concluded with an urgent appeal to the members to come forward and assist in the furtherance of the objects for which the Society had been formed. After the reading of the Report, Bishop Williams was introduced to the audience, and proceeded to deliver the Triennial Address. He divided the history of the Church into four eras, viz: first, the Colonial, or that antecedent to the Revolution; second, that commencing and ending with the Revolution; third, from the close of the Revolution to the adoption of the National Constitution; fourth, from the adoption of the Constitution to the present date. The events which took place in regard to the Church, and the position it maintained during those periods, were enlarged upon.

An election for officers then took place, which resulted, by unanimous consent, in the selection of the following;—the same as those chosen at the last election, with the exception of Rev. Philip Slaughter, of Virginia, whose name was dropped, and that of Rev. William S. Bartlett, substituted:

President—Rt. Rev. T. C. Brownell, D. D., LL. D.

Vice-President—Rev. Francis L. Hawks, D. D., LL. D.

Secretary—Rev. B. Franklin.

Treasurer—Frederick S. Winston, Esq., No. 60 Cedar street, New York.

Executive Committee—Rev. Wm. Bacon Stevens, D. D., Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. W. S. Bartlett, Petersburg, Va.; Rev. A. B. Paterson, Princeton, N. J.; Rev. J. H. Hobart, New York, N. Y.; Rev. W. I. Kip, D. D., Albany, N. Y.; Rev. T. W. Coit, D. D., Hartford, Ct.; Rev. T. C. Pitkin, New Haven, Ct.; John H. Alexander, Esq., Baltimore, Md.; Samuel H. Huntington, Esq., Hartford, Ct.; Robert Bolton, Jr., Esq., New Rochelle, N. Y.; G. M. Wharton, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa.; E. A. Newton, Esq., Pittsfield, Mass.; G. L. Duykinck, Esq., New York, N. Y.

CONSECRATION OF ROMISH BISHOPS, AND DECEPTIVE ACCOUNT OF THE SERVICES !!

On Sunday, October 30th, three persons were consecrated Romish Bishops in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York; namely, Right Rev. John Loughlin, (Irish,) Bishop of Brooklyn; Right Rev. James Roosevelt Bailey, (American,) Bishop of Newark; and Louis De Goesbriand, (French,) Bishop of Burlington, Vt.

A particular account of the services was given in the New York papers of the following day; and also a translation of the "Oath," previously taken by the Bishops elect. We saw that that translation was not a correct translation of the "Oath," as found in the authorized copies of the *Pontificale Romanum*. A Correspondent of the New York Daily Times of Nov. 3d, gives the "Oath" as read in Latin by the Bishops elect *on their knees*; and marks several passages omitted in the translation into English. He says this mutilated translation was circulated by hundreds and thousands on the occasion; and that copies of it were sent to the press. He also gives a correct translation of the "Oath," and marks the passages which were omitted by the Romanists in their translation and distribution *among* the people. We give the correct translation; with those parts *in brackets* which are said to have been omitted, in the translation which was circulated.

FORM OF THE OATH.

I N, elect of the Church of N., from henceforth will be *faithful* and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our Lord, the Lord N., Pope N., and to his successors, canonically coming in, [I will neither advise, consent, nor do anything that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, or hands anywise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them, under any pretence whatsoever. The counsel which they shall intrust me withal, by themselves, their messengers or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any, to their prejudice.] I will help them to defend and keep the Roman Papacy, [and the royalties of St. Peter,] saving my order, against all men. [The legate of the Apostolic See, going and coming, I will honorably treat, and help in his necessities.] The rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our Lord the Pope, and his aforesaid successors, I will endeavor to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. [I will not be in any counsel, action, or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said Lord, and the said Roman Church, anything to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honor, state, or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power; and as soon as I can, will signify it to our said Lord, or to some other, by whom it may come to his knowledge.] The rules of the Holy Fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, [reservations, provisions,] and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. [Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord, or his foresaid successors, I will to my power persecute and oppose.] I will come to council when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will by myself in person, visit the threshold of the Apostles every three years; and give an account to our Lord, and his aforesaid successors, of all my pastoral office, and of all things anywise belonging to the state of my Church, to the discipline of my clergy and people, and lastly to the salvation of souls committed to my trust; and will, in like manner, humbly receive and diligently execute the apostolic commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger hereto specially empowered, a member of my chapter, or some other in ecclesiastical dignity, or else having a parsonage; or, in default of these, by a priest of the diocese, [or in default of one of the clergy of the diocese,] by some other secular or regular priest of approved integrity and religion, fully instructed in all things above mentioned. [And such impediment I will make out by lawful proofs to be transmitted by the aforesaid messenger to the cardinal proponent of the holy Roman Church in the Congregation of the Sacred Council.] The possessions belonging to my table I will never sell, or give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor anywise alienate, no, not even with the consent of the chapter of my Church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff. And if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby incur the penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God.

It is worthy of note, that Mons. Bedini, Nuncio of Pope Pius IX, officiated as consecrator; the same man, who as Governor of Bologna, was charged with the death of the "patriot" priest, Ugo Bassi.

It is proper to add, that it is now pretended that the Pope, at the instance of the Romish Bishops in the United States, has set forth an abbreviated FORM OF OATH, with permission to use it. But, the Romanists do not deny that the above oath, in full, was used at the consecration as aforesaid.

DEPOSITION OF THE REV. WILLIAM F. WALKER, OF NEW YORK.

This singular case of ecclesiastical discipline has at last been terminated, so far as ecclesiastical action is concerned. Suit after suit has been commenced in the civil courts, injunction after injunction has been issued, for the impeding or annulling of canonical action. The last injunction was obtained just on the evening before sentence was to be pronounced by the Provisional Bishop.

The injunction being dissolved, the Provisional Bishop of the Diocese, after due notice given, did, on Friday, Oct. 14th, at half past nine o'clock, A. M., in St.

John's Chapel, New York, solemnly depose and degrade the Rev. William F. Walker from the Holy Ministry in the Church of God, and from all and every power and function of the same. This sentence was pronounced and recorded in St. John's Chapel, and attested by the Rev. Dr. Berrian, the Rev. Mr. Eigenbrodt, and the Rev. Mr. Hobart; many others of the Clergy and Laity being likewise present.

INDIANS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.

We find the following interesting items and suggestions in the Report of the Commissioner on Indian Affairs, as follows:

The number of Indians within our limits is estimated at 400,000. About 18,000 linger in the states east of the Mississippi—principally in New York, Michigan, and Wisconsin—the remainder are (Cherokees, Choctaws, and Seminoles) in North Carolina, Mississippi, and Florida.

The number in Minnesota and along the frontiers of Western States, to Texas (mainly emigrated tribes) is estimated at 110,000; in the Plains and Rocky Mountains, and not within any of our organized territories, at 63,000; in Texas, at 59,000; in New Mexico, at 45,000; in California, at 100,000; in Utah, at 12,000; and in the territories of Oregon and Washington, at 23,000.

The whole amount payable, and to be expended on account of the Indian service, the present fiscal year, is \$1,015,735 50, of which \$532,907 81 is for money annuities, \$136,676 50 for goods and provisions, \$61,961 89 for educational purposes, \$94,318 80 for agricultural and mechanical assistance, and \$189,870 50 for other miscellaneous purposes, for the benefit of the Indians.

Long experience having proved, that the money annuity system has done as much, if not more, to cripple and thwart the efforts of the Government, to domesticate and civilize the Indian tribes, than any of the many serious obstacles with which we have to contend, it is recommended that, in future, whatever may be the extent of consideration allowed for land ceded to the Government, by an undomesticated tribe, it should consist chiefly of goods, subsistence, agricultural implements, and assistance, stock animals, and the means of mental, moral, and industrial education and training.

AMERICAN ANTIQUITIES.

The Mounds—Remains of an extinct Race.—The Wheeling (Virginia) Times gives the following account of the opening of a large mound on the flats of Grove Creek:

The mound is situated on the farm of Mr. Price, some mile or more on the east of Moundsville, and was partially opened by Mr. Morris and others, in 1852. They discovered and got out a part of a stone covered with characters, similar to the one found in the large mound, but of larger size. This portion was sent to an institution at Richmond, soon after its discovery, and there lost sight of. The smaller stone found in the mound, has not been carefully preserved, and the existence of it, with the singular characters thereon, as a relic of a past and another people than any with whom the English settlers of this country are acquainted, has been denied by persons who have published voluminous works within the past five years. The object of digging into this mound at this time, was, to find, if possible, the remainder of the stone, and thus establish the fact, rendered certain to the minds of all those who have seen either of those already found, viz: that the ones who built these mounds had an alphabet; and could, by that, convey ideas to the minds of absent persons, in language. It is well known that Indians had no such means—no written alphabet.

It is true, there are such other proofs beside these that there was an anterior race, who occupied our valleys; and the objects now seen in the valley, at the mouth of Grove Creek, lead us to the conclusion that that valley was once densely populated by an intelligent and warlike people.

NOTE.—A large amount of Intelligence, Foreign and Domestic, is unavoidably laid over.

